[This Document is the Property of Her Britannic Majesty's Government.]

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. March 1895.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(6571.)

FO 423/28

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

SUEZ CANAL.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 6433.]

1894.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
1	Sir. J. Stokes ..	..	Jan. 16, 1894	Report as to state of Canal, works, &c. ..	1
2	British Directors ..	2	22,	Sends copy of letter to Admiralty respecting dispute as to mooring vessels off Port Said..	3
3	To Sir J. Stokes ..	Commercial Commercial	25,	Thanks for No. 1	4
4	British Directors ..	4	Feb. 3,	Sends estimate on probable dividend for 1893 .	5
5	Sir J. Stokes ..	Commercial	6,	Resignation of MM. Charles and Victor de Lesseps. Mr. Austin Lee to be elected to the Managing Committee. Supports and reports on question of fees	6
6	To Treasury ..	..	8,	Sends No. 5 for reply as to Mr. Lee's emoluments	8
7	Treasury	..	8,	Reviews expenditure of Company for 1893. Inquiries as to intentions of Company for borrowing in 1894	9
8	"	..	12,	Answers No. 6	9
9	British Directors ..	5	13,	Informs of retirement and election of M. de Lesseps as Honorary President of the Company, and of election of MM. Lee and Patinot to Managing Committee	10
10	Sir J. Stokes ..	Confidential	13,	Company express satisfaction at decision contained in No. 8	11
11	To British Directors..	3	19,	Sends No. 7 for report	11
12	British Directors ..	6	13,	Reports provision made for the De Lesseps family	12
13	To Mr. Austin Lee ..	..	27,	Sends Nos. 5 and 9. Lord Rosebery concurs in arrangements	13
14	To Treasury ..	..	27,	Acknowledges No. 8. Lord Rosebery concurs	13
15	To Sir J. Stokes ..	..	27,	Sends No. 8. Lord Rosebery concurs in arrangement	14
16	British Directors ..	7	Mar. 6,	Answers No. 11	14
17	" " ..	8	6,	Appointment of Sir H. Calcraft and M. Vergé to the Board *vice* Lord Brassey and the late M. Waddington	15
18	" " ..	9	12,	Settlement of question of circulation of Egyptian Government service boats in the Canal	15
19	" " ..	11	Apr. 3,	Refers No. 2. Sends copy of reply from Admiralty	17
20	Treasury	..	6,	Arrangements for Mr. Lee's remuneration ..	18
21	To Treasury ..	..	13,	Acknowledges No. 20. Concurs in arrangement	19
22	To Mr. Austin Lee ..	..	13,	Sends copy of No. 20. Lord Kimberley assents to it	19
23	British Directors ..	12	May 1,	Sends Navigation Returns of Canal for 1893, as compared with those of 1891–92 ..	19
24	Admiralty	..	16,	Conference to be held at Paris respecting land at Port Said belonging to Her Majesty's Government. Admiral Rice to represent Admiralty and Indian Government. That Lord Dufferin may afford him facilities, &c..	26
25	"	..	18,	Refers No. 24. Conference to be held early next week. That Lord Dufferin may be informed	27
26	To Marquis of Dufferin	53	19,	Sends copy of No. 24, and informs of No. 25 .	27
27	British Directors ..	13	23,	Annual shareholders' meeting to be held the 5th June. That Treasury certificate as to shares held by Her Majesty's Government may be sent to Paris, and instructions to Secretary of Embassy, if nominated to act as Representative of Her Majesty's Government at meeting	27
28	To Treasury ..	..	25,	Informs of No. 27. Certificate should be with Directors not later than the 1st proximo ..	28
29	Treasury	..	29,	Sends certificate asked for in No. 28 ..	28
30	British Directors ..	15	26,	Sends details of accounts of Company for 1893	28
31	To Marquis of Dufferin	59	29,	Informs of No. 27. Instructions as to representation of Her Majesty's Government at the meeting. Sends certificate inclosed in No. 29	29

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
32	To Treasury ..	..	June 1, 1894	Sends copy of No. 20	29
33	British Directors ..	16	5,	Sends Report of general meeting of shareholders, with observations	29
34	" " ..	17	10,	Pension arrangements for M. de Lesseps and his two sons	31
35	" " ..	18	11,	Sends Return of groundings in the Canal during 1893	31
36	" " ..	19	12,	Refers No. 33. Sends figures of votes taken at general meeting	34
37	To Treasury ..	..	21,	Sends copy of No. 36	34
38	" " ..	..	28,	Sends copy of No. 34	34
39	British Directors ..	20	29,	Sends stenographic Report of proceedings of general meeting on the 5th instant ..	34
40	" " ..	21	July 4,	Refers No. 34. Sends amended decision as to payments of pension to the De Lesseps family	35
41	To Treasury ..	..	10,	Refers No. 38. Sends copy No. 40 ..	36
42	Mr. Rodd	100	6,	Sends Petition from residents to Consul at Port Said respecting water supply at that town, for support of British Directors against action of the Company	36
43	To British Directors..	7	25,	Sends copy of No. 42 for necessary action, if grievance is well founded ..	37
44	British Directors ..	22	Aug. 7,	Acknowledges No. 43. Question under consideration of Board. Have again called attention to it	37
45	To Mr. Rodd ..	26	11,	No. 42 communicated to British Directors. Sends copy of No. 44	37
46	Mr. Rodd ..	112 Telegraphic	Sept. 18,	Reports strike of Europeans employed on Canal dredgers assuming threatening attitude	38
46*	Mr. Rodd† ..	116 Telegraphic	23,	Refers No. 46. To urge British Directors to persuade Company to be conciliatory towards the strikers—whose case is hard	39
47	To Mr. Austin Lee ..	Telegraphic	24,	Invite Company to adopt conciliatory attitude towards strikers	38
48	Mr. Rodd	119 Telegraphic	27,	Company have refused strikers' demands. Suggests pressure at Paris. Repeated to Paris	38
49	Mr. Phipps ..	2 Telegraphic	27,	Will act on No. 48. Has acted on No. 47 ..	38
50	" " ..	..	27,	Sends copy of telegraphic instructions sent by Company to their Agent at Cairo.. ..	38
50*	Admiralty	..	27,	Acknowledges receipt of Return of groundings in the Suez Canal in 1893; and requests copy of the Returns for 1891–92.. ..	38*
51	(See No. 46*.)				
52	To Mr. Rodd ..	Telegraphic	28,	Company determined to make no concession. Is police adequate to protect Company's property	39
53	Mr. Rodd	Telegraphic	29,	Answers No. 52. Police force should be sufficient	40
54	Memorandum communicated by Mr. Austin Lee	..	29,	Statement on the strike	40
55	To Mr. Austin Lee ..	Telegraphic	30,	No. 53 may be communicated to Company ..	44
56	Mr. Rodd	141	30,	Reports strike and possible consequences ..	44
57	" "	Telegraphic	30,	Strikers quiet. Chief engineer wounded ..	45
58	Mr. Austin Lee ..	Telegraphic	Oct. 1,	Chief engineer assassinated	45
59	To Mr. Austin Lee ..	..	1,	Informs of No. 57	45
60	British Directors ..	Telegraphic	1,	Have not acted on No. 55 in view of No 58. Company sending delegates to Egypt ..	46
60*	To British Directors..	8	1,	Asks for Returns of groundings in the Suez Canal in 1891–92	46*
61	To Mr. Rodd ..	Telegraphic	2,	Informs of No. 60	46
62	Mr. Rodd	Telegraphic	2,	Strikers reinforced. Consul at Port Said fears landing of French blue-jackets. Lord Cromer arrives to-night	46
63	To Sir J. Stokes ..	.	3,	Informs of No. 62	46
64	British Directors ..	23	1,	Report on strike, and steps taken in consequence	47
65	Mr. Austin Lee ..	Telegraphic	4.	President of Company expresses wish that Lord Cromer should induce Egyptian Government to take strike seriously in hand. Strike spreading	48
66	To Lord Cromer ..	Telegraphic	4.	Directors determined to stand firm, and look to Egyptian Government to keep order. Telegraph your views	48

† This appears in the text as No. 51.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
67	Lord Cromer ..	Telegraphic	Oct. 4, 1894	Visit to Port Saïd. Impressions on strike ..	49
68	" " ..	Telegraphic	5,	Egyptian Government is doing all that is possible. Local opinion as to strike ..	49
69	British Directors ..	24 Confidential	5,	Company wish Lord Cromer and French Minister should rouse Egyptian Government from their apathy in the matter ..	50
70	To Sir J. Stokes ..	..	6,	Sends substance of No. 68	50
71	Mr. Rodd	21	3,	Sends report from Consul at Port Saïd on strike. Observations on position of Egyptian Government	50
72	To Sir J. Stokes ..	..	11,	Sends extract of Inclosures in No. 71 ..	51
73	Lord Cromer ..	Telegraphic	12,	Strikers to be paid passage home and a small indemnity. Matter will thus be settled ..	52
74	Admiralty	..	18,	Sends report from Commander of Her Majesty's ship "Melita" on the strike ..	52
75	Lord Cromer ..	22	8,	Final report on strike. Assassination of M. Lemasson not attributed to strikers ..	53
76	Mr. Austin Lee ..	..	29,	Observations on Inclosure 1 in No. 50 ..	53
77	British Directors ..	25	Nov. 5,	Refers No. 44. Price of water supplied by Company to inhabitants of Port Saïd to be reduced from the 1st January next ..	54
78	Admiralty	..	7,	Reports overcharged for hire of tug for Her Majesty's ship "Crescent." Asks that claim for repayment may be made to Company	54
79	Lord Cromer ..	23	1,	Refers No. 72. Sends extract of despatch from Port Saïd reporting settlement of strike	55
80	British Directors ..	26	6,	Details cost of repatriating strikers. Appointment of M. Quellenec as Chief Engineer	55
81	To British Directors ..	10	12,	Sends copy of No. 78, for inquiry and report ..	56
82	British Directors ..	27	26,	Replies to No. 81. Orders sent for overcharge to be reimbursed to Admiralty authorities	56
83	" " ..	28	Dec. 10,	Refers No. 60*. Sends Returns	57
84	To Sir J. Stokes ..	Separate	12,	Should attend funeral of M. de Lesseps as Vice-President of the Company	62
85	Treasury	..	13,	Sends letter from Admiralty respecting cancel of lease of land at Port Saïd held by Mrs. Dowrie, for Lord Cromer's opinion ..	62
86	To Lord Cromer ..	42	17,	Sends No. 85, for opinion..	63
87	Sir J. Stokes ..	Separate	24,	Refers to No. 84. Reports on M. de Lesseps' funeral	63

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. January 1895.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting the Suez Canal.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 6433.]

No. 1.

Sir J. Stokes to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received January 17.)

(Separate.)

My Lord, *London, January* 16, 1894.

I TOOK advantage of my visit to the Suez Canal last month to make a technical inspection of it, and have the honour to report upon it as follows.

Twenty years have passed since I first reported on the Canal for Her Majesty's Government, and seven years since my last personal inspection.

The improvements in its condition since January 1874 have been very notable, and since December 1886 the great works recommended by the International Technical Commission of 1885 have been commenced and carried forward, though not with the rapidity at that time proposed.

In 1874 there were two serious defects to be dealt with:—

(*a*.) The silting up of the entrance to Port Saïd from the sea.

(*b*.) The sharpness of several bends in the Canal, those at El Guisr and in Lake Timsah being the most difficult for ships to get through.

I was able to report in 1876 that the first of these defects had been removed by a system of annual dredging in the summer, and I am able to state now that the experience of the last twenty years shows that this is effectual for the purpose of keeping open the Port Saïd entrance.

In 1880 I was able to report, again from personal inspection, that the difficult bends at El Guisr and in Lake Timsah had been widened and straightened.

Since 1887, when I last made my personal report, a very considerable improvement of the Canal has in every way been made by the expenditure of the loan authorized by the shareholders in 1885. The principal features of this improvement are:—

1. The deepening of the Canal through its whole length by half-a-metre.
2. The widening of the bed of the channel by 15 metres as under:—

	Kilom.	met.	Kilom.	met.
The total length of the Canal being			160	542
Deduct for the Bitter Lakes and the Port Saïd Basins ..	15	892		
and for parts widened before 1887	26	375		
			42	267
left to be widened..			118	275

Of these, 66 kilom. 200 metres had been, and 27 kilom. 525 metres were being, widened as under, on Christmas Day 1893:—

Section of Canal.	Lengths widened since 1st January, 1887.		Lengths now being widened.	
	Kilom.	met.	Kilom.	met.
Port Saïd Section	44	100	—	500
Ismailia Section	7	590	25	275
Suez Section..	14	510	1	750
Totals	66	200	27	525

3. The bends in the Canal have been straightened and widened, as shown in the Table below:—

Designation of Bends.	Situated between Kilometres—	Internal Radius.		Width at Summit of Curve.	
		Before Improvement.	After Improvement.	Before Improvement.	After Improvement.
		Metres c.	Metres c.	Metres c.	Metres c.
El Ferdane	60 and 63	2,090 00	2,329 62	20 00	46 93
Sud d'El Guisr	74 „ 76	2,147 42	2,600 00	20 00	50 00
Chantier VI	76 „ 78	2,100 15	2,126 22	37 00	50 00
East of Lake Timsah ..	78 „ 80	886 25	1,250 00	Lake Timsah siding.	
Toussoum	85 „ 87	1,990 00	2,500 00	20 00	34 34
Suez Plain	145 „ 146	2,990 00	8,862 92	20 00	45 00
Elevators	154 „ 156	3,000 00	4,658 33	25 00	45 00

4. The revetment of the banks with stone for 46,842 metres on the African side, 565 metres on the Asiatic side.

5. The creation of additional basins for the accommodation of shipping at Port Saïd, and of smaller basins at Suez for engineering plant, boats, &c.

6. The placing of additional bollards for mooring vessels along the whole length of the Canal banks, and of buoys marking the channel.

7. The placing of lighted buoys in the bends and of leading lights on the land to permit navigation by night with the electric light.

8. The erection of new workshops and storehouses at Port Saïd, where vessels and the Company's own plant can get repaired.

9. The erection of new offices and dwellings for the employés of the Company at Port Saïd and Suez in lieu of the temporary buildings put up previous to the opening of the Canal in 1869.

10. The removal of the unsightly huts and barracks where the workmen were lodged during the cutting of the Canal, and the erection of neat dwellings at all of the sidings along the Canal where the superintendents of the movements of the ships through the Canal are lodged.

11. The construction of a Fresh-water Canal from Ismaïlia to Port Saïd. Works for filtering the Nile water thus brought down, and distributing it by gravitation to every house in the town, are now in course of erection, and should be completed by the end of 1894.

12. The construction of a steam-tramway from Ismaïlia to Port Saïd. This was originally intended only for the technical service of the Company, but it already promises to become an important commercial route.

Under a Convention with the Egyptian Government mails and passengers are carried upon it, and Port Saïd is thus brought into connection with the whole of the railway system of Egypt. The inauguration of the line by His Highness the Khedive last month has given a certain *éclat* to it, and already, before I left Egypt, there was a considerable passenger traffic upon it.

There is one point in the development of the Canal's power to meet the requirements of trade which I think it interesting to add, and that is, the increasing size of the vessels using it. That increase is of itself the motive for and justification of the large sums spent upon its improvement.

The numbers and tonnage of vessels at every fifth year since 1872 are as follows:—

	Number.	Tonnage.	Mean Tonnage per Ship.
1872	1,082	1,714,481	1,584
1877	1,663	3,418,949	2,049
1882	3,198	7,122,125	2,226
1887	3,137	8,430,043	2,687
1892	3,559	10,866,401	3,053

Thus, the mean tonnage per ship has grown from 1,584 to 3,053, or 92 per cent., whilst the length of vessels navigating the Canal has increased from 400 to 500 feet. Vessels of this latter length could not have passed round the bends as they were twenty

years ago; and as vessels go on increasing in size the Canal Company will have to give this channel the full dimensions both of width and depth provided for in the second and third phases of the works recommended by the International Technical Commission of 1885. Indeed, there are commercial men who already demand that the depth of the Canal should be another 2 metres beyond that proposed.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.

No. 2.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received January 24.)

(No. 2. Commercial.)

Paris, January 22, 1894.

My Lord,

WE have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a letter we have addressed to the Secretary of the Admiralty with regard to a long-standing discussion between the Lords of the Admiralty and the Suez Canal Company as to the right of mooring ships alongside the land owned by the Admiralty on the bank of the Canal at Port Saïd.

We have, &c.
(For the British Directors),
(Signed) H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 2.

British Suez Canal Directors to Admiralty.

Paris, January 20, 1894.

Sir,

IN your letter of the 16th March, 1893, concerning the matter in dispute between the Admiralty and the Suez Canal Company as to the mooring of vessels off the Admiralty land at Port Saïd, you informed us that the whole case had been put before the Law Officers of the Crown, and that their opinion was adverse to the claim of the Company. This being so, you asked whether we considered further steps necessary to satisfy the Company as to the rights claimed by the British Government.

At the time of receiving this communication we did not think it opportune to take any further steps, as M. Charles de Lesseps, who had hitherto discussed the subject with us, was involved in the difficulties arising out of the Panamá prosecutions, and no definitive arrangements had been made for the administration of the Company's affairs.

These arrangements were made during the last autumn, and Sir John Stokes, during his visit to Egypt last month, took advantage of his intercourse with Her Majesty's Agent and Consul-General, Lord Cromer, to consult him as to the probable issue of a law-suit between Her Majesty's Government and the Canal Company.

Lord Cromer expressed strong doubts as to the possibility of the case being tried as proposed by their Lordships, but to make quite sure of the point, he addressed a letter, of which copy is inclosed, to Sir Charles Cookson, Her Majesty's Consul at Alexandria. On remembering that gentleman's absence from Alexandria on leave, he desired the Vice-Consul to refer his letter to Mr. Charles Royle, a leading barrister there, for his opinion on the legal point.

I inclose herewith Mr. Royle's answer, and translation of a Judgment, which, you will observe, confirm Lord Cromer's impression, and suggests a way by which a Judgment could be obtained.

Lord Cromer handed these papers to Sir John Stokes, with the recommendation that if their Lordships still desire to have the case brought before the Courts they should send out all the papers, with the case submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, and their opinion upon it, in order that the further opinion of a competent barrister such as Mr. Royle, versed in the law in Egypt, and knowing the temper of the Mixed Tribunals, might be taken upon the case before their Lordships were finally committed to such proceedings.

As he was leaving Egypt, and subsequently to his above consultation with Lord Cromer, Sir John Stokes was formally requested by his colleagues on the Canal Council now in Egypt to have this question settled as promptly as possible, as the transit service was seriously inconvenienced by the question remaining longer in suspense.

The Provisional Arrangement agreed to in 1891 excludes a portion of the Ismaïl Basin from their mooring ground, but it was only considered temporary, and the [?] desire

to have it settled. Would their Lordships allow us to make one more effort to arrange a compromise, as suggested in our letter of the 20th October, 1892?

We are, &c.
(Signed)

Inclosure 2 in No. 2.

Lord Cromer to Sir C. Cookson.

My dear Cookson, *Cairo, December* 17, 1893.

A DISPUTE has been going on for some while between the Admiralty and the Suez Canal Company as regards the right of the Company to moor vessels in the immediate proximity to certain lands at Port Saïd which are the property of the Admiralty.

The view taken by the legal advisers of the Company is different to that of the English Law Officers.

It has been suggested that the matter might be brought before the Mixed Courts. The domicile of the Company, as you are without doubt aware, is in Egypt.

Sir J. Stokes, who is staying with me, has consulted me on the subject.

My impression is that the Mixed Courts have no jurisdiction in the matter, and that the English Government, represented by the Admiralty, cannot either sue or be sued in those Courts. I should be glad if you would tell me whether you concur in this view.

Please send me an early answer, as Sir J. Stokes will probably be leaving for England at the end of the week.

Very, &c.
(Signed) CROMER.

Inclosure 3 in No. 2.

Mr. Royle to Lord Cromer.

Dear Lord Cromer, *Alexandria, December* 18, 1893.

MR. ALBAN has asked me to write to you unofficially in reply to your letter to Sir Charles Cookson with reference to the jurisdiction of the Mixed Tribunals in the event of an action being brought by the Admiralty against the Suez Canal Company to decide the right of the former to moor vessels in immediate proximity to the Admiralty land at Port Saïd.

I am sending you by book-post a translation of a Judgment which I obtained in the Court of Appeal in 1888, in an action brought in the name of the Chief of the Commissariat of the British army against a native Pasha on a sale of camels. You will please note the grounds of the decision, viz., that it was a question of a private character.

I consider that, according to this Judgment, the Mixed Tribunals would be competent to try the proposed action, which I would suggest should be brought (if at all) in the name of the Senior Naval Officer for the time being at Port Saïd, and based upon the contract of sale and the rights thereby acquired by the Admiralty.

I do not consider myself, at this stage, called upon to express any opinion on the merits of the case, or to point out the steps to be taken to prove the infringement of the rights of the Admiralty.

I am, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES ROYLE.

No. 3.

Foreign Office to Sir J. Stokes.

(Separate. Commercial.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, January* 25, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Rosebery to convey to you his Lordship's thanks for the interesting Report on the present condition of the Suez Canal, which formed the subject of your despatch, marked Separate, of the 16th instant.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

No. 4.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received February* 6.)

(No. 4. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, February* 3, 1894.

ALTHOUGH the accounts for 1893 have not yet been finally adopted, we are able to report with tolerable accuracy the amount which will be available for distribution among the shareholders of the Suez Canal Company in the current year.

It is estimated that the total receipts from the Suez Canal traffic in the year 1893 will amount to 73,272,000 fr., and the total expenses, including loan charges, to 35,586,005 fr. 94 c., leaving a net profit of 37,685,994 fr. 6 c.

With the interest of 25 fr. this will give a gross dividend of 91·892 fr., and with the Government taxes deducted, a net revenue of 85·315 fr. per share.

In view, however, of the Delegations terminating this year it is proposed, as reported to your Lordship in our despatch No. 7 of the 20th May, 1892, to divide the sum of 1,500,000 fr., which was laid aside as a special reserve out of the receipts of 1891, and also the sum of 1,235,933 fr. 49 c., by which the statutory reserve of 5,000,000 fr. is at present exceeded, and which, according to the Resolution of the shareholders of the 29th May, 1884, the Council are authorized to add to the dividend in any year.

Adding these two reserve funds to the net profits will make a total of 40,421,927 fr. 55 c., giving, with interest, a gross revenue of 96·748 fr. per share, or with the Government taxes deducted, 90 fr. 35 c.

Of this amount there has already been distributed to the shareholders on account at 1st January, 36·875 fr. per share.

We beg to inclose a copy of a tabular Statement which we have received from the Company confirmatory of the above figures.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure in No. 4.

ESTIMATE of probable Dividend for the year 1893.

	Fr. c.	Fr. c.
Recettes de l'Exercice 1893	..	73,272,000 00
Dépenses de toute nature	32,049,005 94	
Charges d'emprunt	3,537,000 00	
		35,586,005 94
Bénéfice net	..	37,685,994 06
Donnant un dividende brut de	66,892 00	
Intérêts	25,000 00	
Brut	91,892 00	
Net	85,315 00	
A ajouter—		
Réserve spéciale	..	1,500,000 00
Excédent de la réserve statutaire	..	1,235,933 49
Total	..	40,421,927 55
Donnant un dividende brut de	71,748 00	
Intérêts	25,000 00	
Revenu total brut	96,748 00	
" " net	90,035 00	

* Copy sent to Treasury, February 10, 1894.

No. 5.

Sir J. Stokes to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received February 7.)

(Separate. Commercial.)

My Lord, *London, February 6, 1894.*

I LEARN that Messrs. Charles and Victor de Lesseps have resigned their membership of the Managing Committee of the Suez Canal Company. As your Lordship is aware, this Committee consists of four members who are intrusted by the Statutes with the practical management of the entire affairs of the Company, without the necessity in all cases of their action being approved by the Council of Administration, the Committee meeting frequently, whilst the Council are assembled only once a-month.

In 1876 M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, in the name of the Suez Canal Company, and myself, acting under the authority of Her Majesty's Government, signed a Convention by which all difficulties until then existing between the Maritime Powers and the Suez Canal Company were removed, and a more favourable position for that Company as regards dues was established.

Under special instructions from Her Majesty's Government, I obtained an agreement which was embodied in the Protocols also signed by the Contracting Parties, that three English Directors should be placed on the Council of the Company, one of whom would reside in Paris and be a member of the Managing Committee, M. de Lesseps undertaking to make him an honorary member of the Committee until a regular vacancy should occur, it being the custom to name three or four Directors as honorary members in order to insure a quorum.

Mr. Standen was accordingly named an honorary member of the Committee in 1876, and in 1887 M. de Lesseps expressed a desire to nominate him a statutory member of the Committee, but made it a condition that he should receive the fees attached to the office. It is necessary here to explain that on the original appointment of the official Directors an arrangement was made by which an annual fixed salary was assigned by Her Majesty's Government to each of the official Directors, whilst the fees they received from the Company for their services as Directors were handed by them into the Treasury.

A correspondence with regard to M. de Lesseps' proposal ensued between the British Directors and the Foreign Office, and the Treasury agreed in their letter of the 4th January, 1888, to accede to it, on condition of Mr. Standen resigning his official salary of 1,000*l.* a-year and all claim to pension.

Mr. Standen accepted these terms, and was appointed statutory member of the Committee by the Council in January 1888.

On Mr. Standen's resignation in 1891, Mr. Austin Lee was appointed Resident Director at Paris at a reduced salary of 500*l.* a-year, and was at once made by the Council honorary member of the Managing Committee. He is now second in seniority of the honorary members, whom it has hitherto been the custom to appoint in order of seniority to vacancies in that Committee.

On learning from Mr. Austin Lee that Messrs. Charles and Victor de Lesseps had resigned, and that there was a considerable feeling among the Directors in favour of setting aside the mode of filling vacancies hitherto adopted, and that therefore his appointment to the Committee was rendered doubtful, I wrote to the President a letter, of which I inclose a copy, reminding him of the agreement entered into by M. de Lesseps in 1876, and claiming for Mr. Austin Lee one of the vacancies which had occurred.

I have received from M. Guichard, the Acting President, the inclosed letter, in which he states that it is the desire of the Council to appoint Mr. Austin Lee, and thus give satisfaction to the claim which I put forward for the fulfilment of the agreement of 1876.

He lays down, however, the same condition as was made in Mr. Standen's case, namely, that the fees attaching to the office for the special services rendered to the Company should be received by the holder of it.

I think it right to state here, for your Lordship's information, that there has from the beginning been a strong feeling on the part of our French colleagues against the fees earned by the English official Directors as remuneration for services to the Company being received by Her Majesty's Government, and M. Guichard has stated that, were the shareholders generally aware of this fact, it would provoke an outburst

of feeling on their part which might imperil the re-election of the British official Directors when their present period of service expires.

I have the honour to submit to your Lordship that it is very important that the Resident Director in Paris should be a statutory member of the Managing Committee. These statutory members alone have a vote on the matters dealt with by the Committee.

The honorary members, when present, can urge their views, but have no voting power, and their appointment not being statutory, important decisions may be taken without reference to them.

I may add that the duties of the Committee have become of much greater importance since the recent changes in the Company's administration. As long as M. Charles de Lesseps directed their affairs, it was his practice to consult us before any important decision was taken; but now we have no guarantee that this will be done, and, in point of fact, some of the Directors are known to be hostile to British interests and British influence in the Company's management.

I am strongly of opinion that if Her Majesty's Government decline the offer now made to them, and thus voluntarily abandon the concession for which, by their instructions, I fought in 1876, it will be looked upon by our French colleagues as a surrender of their authority, and as tantamount to an intention to take a less prominent part in the Company's management.

I need hardly point out the prejudicial effects of such an impression, and it is my duty to inform your Lordship that the British Commercial Directors are strongly of opinion that it is highly desirable in their interests that one of the four statutory members of the Managing Committee should be our Resident Director in Paris.

I have not had the advantage of consulting Sir Rivers Wilson, but I know that, as in Mr. Standen's case, he generally shares the views which I have expressed.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. STOKES.

Inclosure 1 in No. 5.

Sir J. Stokes to the President of the Suez Canal Company.

M. le Président, *Londres, le 24 Janvier, 1894.*

AYANT été informé par Mr. Austin Lee que MM. Charles et Victor de Lesseps se sont décidés à donner leurs demissions des fonctions de membres du Comité de Direction, je crois devoir vous rappeler les stipulations de l'accord auquel M. Ferdinand de Lesseps de la part de la Compagnie et le Soussigné de la part du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique sont arrivés au mois de Février 1876.

Les points principaux étaient incorporés dans une Convention de quatre Articles, et les négociations étaient consignées dans trois procès-verbaux des 3, 21, et 22 Février régulièrement signés en double original par les deux négociateurs.

Ces procès-verbaux contenaient des stipulations de part et d'autre qui liaient les deux parties et qui ont été fidèlement observées. Dans le procès-verbal du 21 Février se trouve le passage suivant:—

"Le Colonel Stokes dit que le Gouvernement de la Reine verrait avec satisfaction qu'un des trois Administrateurs Anglais soit éventuellement élu au Comité de Direction. M. de Lesseps s'engage à faire ce qui dépendra de lui pour satisfaire à ce vœu du Gouvernement Britannique, et quand même il n'y aurait pas lieu de pourvoir à une vacance dans le Comité, il sera très heureux de s'éclairer par la collaboration d'un Administrateur Anglais qu'il appellerait comme membre adjoint du Comité de Direction."

Ces documents doivent se trouver dans les archives de la Compagnie mais après tant d'années ils ont été peut-être perdus de vue. C'est pourquoi je me permets de vous les rappeler.

Ils se trouvent aussi dans le recueil des documents présentés au Parliament sous le titre "Egypt No. 9 (1876)," qui doit aussi être dans les archives.

Je ne doute point, M. le Président, que vous reconnaîtrez ce titre de Mr. Austin Lee à être élu au Comité en conformité avec les stipulations précises ci-dessus citées.

Veuillez, &c.

(Signé) J. STOKES.

Inclosure 2 in No. 5.

M. Guichard to Sir J. Stokes.

M. le Vice-Président, *Paris, le 30 Janvier*, 1894.

J'AI l'honneur de vous accuser réception de votre lettre du 24 courant, par laquelle vous voulez bien me rappeler les stipulations arrêtées au mois de Février 1876, entre le Colonel Stokes, représentant le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique, et M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, représentant la Compagnie du Canal de Suez.

Notre collègue, Mr. Austin Lee, avait déjà appelé mon attention sur ces stipulations dès que l'intention de MM. Charles et Victor de Lesseps de donner leur démission de membres du Comité de Direction a été portée à la connaissance du Comité, dans sa séance du Jeudi, 18 courant.

Je m'empresse de vous répondre, ainsi que je l'ai fait à Mr. Austin Lee, qu'en tout état de cause, le désir des membres du Conseil était de le nommer titulaire du Comité à la première vacance qui se présenterait.

Les grands intérêts que possèdent, dans la Compagnie de Suez, le Gouvernement et le commerce Britanniques justifient pleinement cette mesure.

Les documents présentés au Parlement Anglais sous le titre "Egypt No. 9 (1876)," se trouvent dans nos archives; j'ai donné l'ordre de les traduire afin qu'ils puissent être mis sous les yeux du Conseil. Ces documents sont de nature à motiver la décision que vous réclamez, et qui eut été adoptés quand même ils n'eussent point existés.

Nous sommes donc parfaitement d'accord.

Permettez-moi d'ajouter qu'il serait nécessaire que Mr. Austin Lee, ou tout autre Administrateur Anglais entrant au Comité, y fût assimilé en tous points à ses trois collègues, et par conséquent touchât les mêmes allocations. Outre la considération du travail exceptionnel qui incombe au Comité, il en est d'autres que je dois vous signaler. Une différence de situation semblerait anormale entre des collaborateurs ayant une responsabilité commune; elle risquerait de nuire à l'autorité de celui qui en est l'objet. En cas de procès devant nos Tribunaux, il importe que personne ne puisse objecter qu'un membre du Comité en fait partie au titre de fonctionnaire Anglais. Cette situation avait été précédemment réglée pour Mr. Standen: il y avait égalité de traitement entre lui et ses autres collègues du Comité.

C'est une condition qu'il me paraît essentiel de maintenir.

Si ces observations vous paraissent justes, je vous serais reconnaissant de vouloir bien les soumettre vous-même à qui de droit.

Si vous croyez qu'il est préférable que je m'adresse directement au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté au nom du Conseil d'Administration, je suis prêt à le faire. Je vous prierai alors de m'indiquer quelle est la voie qui doit être suivie.

Veuillez, &c.
(Pour le Président),
(Signé) J. GUICHARD.

No. 6.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, February* 8, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Rosebery to transmit to you a despatch from Lieutenant-General Sir John Stokes respecting the possible election of Mr. Austin Lee to be a member of the Managing Committee of the Suez Canal Company,* and calling attention to the necessity of coming to an arrangement in regard to the fees payable to Mr. Austin Lee by the Company.

I am to recommend to the earnest consideration of the Lords of the Treasury the views set out in this despatch.

Lord Rosebery considers that, under the circumstances, some arrangement should be made similar to that agreed upon in the case of Mr. Standen in January 1888, with such modifications as may be necessary in view of Mr. Lee's position as a Member of Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service.

I am to add that it is necessary that Sir John Stokes should be enabled to give

* No. 5.

an answer on the question of Mr. Austin Lee's appointment not later than Tuesday next.

I am, &c.
(Signed) H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 7.

Treasury to Foreign Office.—(Received February 9.)

Sir, *Treasury Chambers, February* 8, 1894.

THE Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have had before them despatch No. 23, Commercial, of the British Suez Canal Directors, dated the 23rd December last, transmitted by you on the 12th ultimo, and I am to request you to lay the following remarks thereon before the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The estimate of ordinary expenditure for the Canal is taken for 1894 at a figure which lies between the original and final estimates for 1893; but the amount for 1894 includes about 260,000 fr. for the working expenses of the tramway between Ismaïlia and Port Saïd. This tramway, however, may be expected to yield receipts which, as my Lords infer from Sir John Stokes' Report of the 16th January, may be expected at least to cover the working expenses. A fair comparison, therefore, between the two years, indicates a small anticipated reduction of expenditure in the year 1894.

This reduction is due to economies in salaries and administrative expenses, which my Lords are glad to learn are mainly due to action taken at the instance of the official Directors.

On the other hand, there is an increase under "Maintenance" of 169,000 fr. over the final figures of 1893, of which 100,000 fr. is stated to be due to extra dredging. I am to ask for further information as to the cause of this increase, and in particular whether it is expected to be permanent.

Turning to the estimate of "Extraordinary Works" (met out of borrowed money), my Lords observe that out of the total of 4,600,000 fr., it is proposed to spend 3,010,000 fr. on deepening and widening the Canal, in accordance with the "London programme." I am to ask how far the expenditure of that sum will carry the works towards completion, and whether it is to be expected that the "first phase" of those works will be finished in 1895, as hitherto promised. In this connection, my Lords have read with interest Sir John Stokes' Report of the 16th ultimo, forwarded on the 30th ultimo, upon the present condition of the Canal.

As regards the Capital Account, it would appear that only some 2,000,000 fr. remained in hand at the end of 1893 out of the proceeds of the last issue of bonds. If so, at least 2,600,000 fr. will have to be borrowed in the course of 1894 to meet the balance of extraordinary expenditure, as stated above; besides which, it may be necessary, in the event of continued bad traffic, to provide for the charge to capital of the 3,559,000 fr. for interest and sinking fund of the bonds already issued.

I am accordingly to ask what are the intentions of the Company as regards borrowing in 1894.

I am, &c.
(Signed) R. E. WELBY.

No. 8.

Treasury to Foreign Office.—(Received February 12.)

Sir. *Treasury Chambers, February* 12, 1894.

I AM directed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to acquaint you, for the information of the Secretary of State, that they have given their careful consideration to Sir Percy Anderson's letter of the 8th instant on the subject of the election of the Resident English Director of the Suez Canal Company to be a member of the Managing Committee of the Company.

I am to say that my Lords agree with the Secretary of State in thinking it desirable that an arrangement should be made similar to that granted to Mr. Standen, the late Resident Director, and member of the Committee of Management.

Mr. Austin Lee receives at present 500*l.* a-year from the Treasury Vote as Director of the Suez Canal, and 500*l.* a-year as a Secretary of Legation.

My Lords understand that the fees which Mr. Lee will earn as Director and as member of the Committee of Management, should he be elected thereto, will probably exceed those earned by his predecessor, Mr. Standen. Moreover, Mr. Standen had no claim to pension.

Lord Rosebery desires that the arrangement made with Mr. Standen may be renewed for Mr. Austin Lee, with such modification as may be necessary, in view of his position as a member of Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service.

My Lords will therefore propose the following modified arrangement:—

1. That Mr. Austin Lee shall receive the fees which he will earn as Director and member of the Committee of Management.

2. That he shall pay out of them the clerical charges for which provision of 100*l.* per annum has of late been made in the Suez Canal Subhead of the Treasury Vote, and that he shall also pay out of them his own travelling expenses.

3. That he, like Mr. Standen, shall be guaranteed by the Treasury a net receipt of 1,000*l.* a-year.

4. That he shall draw no pay as a member of the Diplomatic Service while he continues to receive the fees.

5. That so long as his remuneration is confined to the fees, he shall earn pension under the Civil Service Superannuation Rules on 1,000*l.* a-year, and that for that purpose he shall receive out of the Suez Canal Subhead of the Treasury Vote a salary of 1,000*l.* a-year, against which he will pay to the Exchequer 1,000*l.* out of the fees received by him.

6. That he shall earn no Diplomatic pension during the time that this arrangement continues in force, but that, should he at any time accept a Diplomatic post, resigning his emoluments as a Director of the Suez Canal, he shall reckon for Diplomatic pension the time during which the present arrangement is in force.

7. That if at any time it should be proposed to give him Diplomatic pay while he receives emoluments as a Director of the Suez Canal, these arrangements shall be revised.

I am, &c.
(Signed) R. E. WELBY.

No. 9.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received February 14.)

(No. 5. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Paris, February* 13, 1894.

M. FERDINAND DE LESSEPS, the President Director of the Suez Canal Company, has for some time past been incapable of attending to the affairs of the Company owing to old age and infirmity, and is now mentally incapable of taking any decision with a view to his retirement. Negotiations have, in consequence, been going on with his family with this object in view.

At the meeting to-day of the Council the inclosed Resolution, to which the assent of M. Ferdinand de Lesseps' family had been obtained, was proposed and adopted unanimously.

Thereupon, M. Guichard, who, as your Lordship is aware, has for some time past been acting as President, was unanimously elected as President of the Company, and Prince d'Arenberg, one of the recently elected Directors, was chosen Vice-President in M. Guichard's place.

A communication was made to the Council of the resignations of MM. Charles and Victor de Lesseps of their posts as members of the Managing Committee, and the names of Mr. Austin Lee and M. Patinot were submitted, and unanimously adopted, as their successors.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure in No. 9.

Resolution.

LE Conseil,

Considérant que l'état de santé de M. Ferdinand de Lesseps le tient malheureusement éloigné, depuis quelques années, des délibérations du Conseil et des travaux du Comité;

Considérant qu'on ne peut conserver l'espoir de le voir reprendre ses fonctions;

Voulant rendre homage au fondateur du Canal dont l'énergie, la persévérance et le génie ont permis l'heureux achèvement de l'œuvre et assuré la prospérité de la Compagnie,

Délibère:

M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, fondateur du Canal de Suez, est nommé Président Honoraire de la Compagnie.

No. 10.

Sir J. Stokes to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received February 19.)

(Separate. Commercial. Confidential.)
My Lord, *Paris, February* 13, 1894.

MR. AUSTIN LEE has communicated to me your Lordship's telegraphic despatch of the 12th instant, informing him that in the event of his election to be a statutory member of the Managing Committee, the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have agreed to his receiving the emoluments and fees assigned to the four Directors of the Suez Canal Company who compose that Committee.

I have informed M. Guichard of this decision, at which he expressed his satisfaction, and Mr. Austin Lee's name will be accordingly submitted to the "Conseil" at their meeting this afternoon for one of the posts rendered vacant by the resignations of MM. Charles and Victor de Lesseps.

I have the honour to add that I have been privately informed that at a meeting of the French Directors, held last Sunday, the validity of the arrangement between M. Ferdinand de Lesseps and myself in 1876 was fully recognized, and Mr. Austin Lee's name was unanimously accepted as a candidate for the first of the vacant posts, subject to the condition to which the Lords of the Treasury have now agreed. For the other vacancy two candidates were put forward, viz., M. Patinot, the well-known editor of the "Journal des Débats," and M. Charles Roux, Deputy for Marseilles, and a leading member of the Free Trade party in the Chamber of Deputies.

On a division M. Patinot obtained the majority of votes, and his name will accordingly be submitted to the "Conseil" in conjunction with that of Mr. Austin Lee.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.

No. 11.

Foreign Office to the British Suez Canal Directors.

(No. 3. Commercial.)
Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, February* 19, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Rosebery to transmit to you a copy of a letter from the Treasury,* to which Department was referred your despatch No. 23, Commercial, of the 23rd December last, respecting the estimates of expenditure for the Suez Canal for the year 1894.

I am to request you to furnish Lord Rosebery with a report on the questions raised by the Treasury in this letter.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

---

* No. 7.

No. 12.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received February 21.)

(No. 6. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, February* 13, 1894.

A CIVIL process has been instituted by the liquidator of the Panamá Company against the MM. de Lesseps as Directors of that Company, under which all their sources of income have been attached.

In connection with the retirement of M. Ferdinand de Lesseps from the Presidency of the Suez Canal Company, and the resignation of his two sons of their posts on the Managing Committee, which form the subject of our preceding despatch of this day's date, we have the honour to report that the Council took into consideration the measures which should be adopted for securing some suitable provision for these gentlemen, in view of the long and important services they have rendered to the Company.

Great difficulties were experienced by the Council in giving effect to their wishes in this direction in consequence of this action of the liquidator of the Panamá Canal Company.

The best legal authorities have therefore been consulted as to the form which any pension or allowances should assume, and the result of this consultation has been the preparation of a carefully worded Resolution, which was submitted to the Council to-day, and of which we have the honour to inclose a copy.

The object to be secured was that the allowances should be put beyond the reach of the creditors, and the lawyers advised that this could not be done if the form of declaration recognized a debt or obligation for services rendered.

It is further to be observed that by French law the coupons of Government funds (in which the payments to the recipients are to be made) are not attachable by creditors.

This would not, however, be the case if the payments were made directly from the revenue of the Company.

The proposal was adopted by the Council, and, pending its formal approval by the shareholders at their next annual meeting, effect will be meanwhile given to it by advances out of the funds appropriated for the remuneration of the Directors.

By the retirement from the Managing Committee of MM. Charles and Victor de Lesseps, and owing to the fact that they are unable to draw their salaries as Directors in consequence of the proceedings connected with the winding-up of the Panamá Canal Company, the Council felt it incumbent upon them to make some substantial provision for these gentlemen who had rendered such long and valuable services to the Company, and the decision was taken to assign to them provisionally, and until a final settlement of their liabilities under the Panamá liquidation, an annual sum of 50,000 fr., 36,000 fr. as an allowance to M. Charles de Lesseps and 14,000 fr. to his brother, M. Victor de Lesseps.

These allowances will be made out of the sums which are appropriated to the remuneration of the Directors generally, and inasmuch as they will be in the shape of personal and voluntary contributions from the Directors, out of their own salaries, they will be free from any danger of attachment by the creditors.

We have, &c.

(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure in No. 12.

Resolution.

LE Conseil,

Considérant que la Compagnie Universelle du Canal Maritime de Suez, sans être tenue, en droit, d'aucune obligation envers la famille de son fondateur, a le devoir moral de ne pas la laisser exposée à des revers de fortune ;

Considérant que l'âge et les conditions de santé de M. Ferdinand de Lesseps ne permettent pas de différer les mesures nécessaires ;

Considérant que les libéralités à faire à la famille de Lesseps ayant pour cause impulsive et déterminante la nécessité d'assurer son avenir, des précautions doivent être prises, pour que les sommes données ne soient pas détournées de leur but,

Décide :

Article 1er. La Compagnie Universelle du Canal Maritime de Suez constitue, à partir du 1er Juillet, 1894, à la famille de Lesseps, à titre de donations, sous la condition, substantielle et *sine quâ non*, que ces donations seront incessibles et insaisissables, les pensions annuelles et viagères ci-après :—

1. Aux treize enfants de M. Ferdinand de Lesseps 60,000 fr. à répartir entre eux par treizième, sans accroissement ;

2. A Mme. Ferdinand de Lesseps 60,000 fr. jusqu'au décès de son mari et 40,000 fr. seulement après son décès, tant qu'elle restera veuve non remariée, avec réversibilité des dites rentes de 60,000 fr. ou de 40,000 fr. sur la tête des treize enfants de M. de Lesseps, à concurrence d'un treizième pour chacun sans accroissement ; les 20,000 fr. de différence entre les 60,000 fr. et les 40,000 fr. de la pension de Mme. F. de Lesseps, mariée ou veuve, devant leur revenir directement à la mort de leur père dans la même proportion.

Toute rente attribuée aux fils de M. F. de Lesseps, actuellement mariés, sera réversible sur la tête de leurs femmes.

Art. 2. Des inscriptions de rentes Françaises 3 pour cent seront immatriculées au nom de la Compagnie de Suez pour la nue propriété et des membres de la famille de Lesseps pour l'usufruit, dans les termes ci-dessus, usufruit devant, dans tous les cas, prendre fin à l'expiration de la durée actuelle de la Compagnie.

Art 3. Tous les frais auxquels pourront donner lieu les présentes, seront à la charge de la Compagnie.

Art. 4. La constitution des pensions sus-énoncées sera soumise au vote de la prochaine assemblée générale des actionnaires.

No. 13.

Foreign Office to Mr. Austin Lee.

(Separate. Commercial.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, February* 27, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Rosebery to transmit herewith, for your information, copies of correspondence, as marked in the margin,* respecting your position as a British Director of the Suez Canal Company and in the Diplomatic Service.

The Lords of the Treasury have been informed that his Lordship assents to the proposal contained in their letter of the 12th instant.

I am, &c.

(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

No. 14.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, February* 27, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Rosebery to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th instant, and I am to acquaint you, in reply, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, that his Lordship assents to the arrangement proposed therein with regard to Mr. Austin Lee's position as a British Director of the Suez Canal Company and as a member of Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service.

I am, &c.

(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

---

* Nos. 5 and 8.

No. 15.

Foreign Office to Sir J. Stokes.

(Separate. Commercial.)

Foreign Office, February 27, 1894.

Sir,

I AM directed by the Earl of Rosebery to transmit herewith a copy of a letter from the Treasury,* to which Department his Lordship caused your letter of the 6th instant respecting Mr. Austin Lee's position to be referred.

The Lords of the Treasury have been informed, in reply, that Lord Rosebery assents to the arrangement proposed in their letter, and Mr. Lee has also been informed to that effect.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

No. 16.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received March 7.)

(No. 7. Commercial.)

Paris, March 6, 1894.

My Lord,

WE have the honour to report as follows on the questions raised in the Treasury letter of the 8th ultimo, a copy of which was forwarded to us for that purpose in Sir E. Grey's despatch No. 3, Commercial, of the 19th ultimo:—

1. As to "Maintenance."

The details of the expenditure contemplated under this head are given in the following Comparative Statement. It would be difficult to say whether the increase for 1894 is likely to be permanent or not, seeing that the expenditure in any particular period depends upon the actual condition of the Canal at the time. The amount of dredging, for instance, which will be necessary next year, cannot be forecast with sufficient accuracy at present to enable an opinion to be formed as to whether the expenditure on that item will be more or less than in 1894.

		Final Estimates, 1893.	Original Estimates, 1894.	Increase in Original Estimates for 1894.	Decrease in Original Estimates for 1894.
		Fr. c.	Fr. c.	Fr. c.	Fr. c.
Earthworks ..	Ismailia section	37,069 30	..	..	37,069 30
Dredging	Outside the jetties, Port Said ..	447,496 00	495,559 97	48,063 97	..
	Inside the jetties, ...	105,481 20	97,723 87	..	7,757 33
	Port Said section of the Canal ..	231,297 90	255,218 63	23,920 73	..
	Ismailia	260,986 05	271,883 75	10,897 70	..
	Suez	372,061 00	394,934 46	22,873 46	..
Sundry works ..	Jetties, Port Said	26,615 40	48,978 51	22,363 11	..
	.. Suez	..	2,964 30	2,964 30	..
	Jetty west of Port Said	137,125 55	191,180 22	54,054 67	..
	Ferry-boat service	17,551 15	15,400 12	..	2,151 03
	Banks of the Canal	249,030 00	279,746 62	30,716 62	..
Surveys, &c. ..	.. ..	8,029 00	8,211 11	182 11	..
Renewal of plant ..	.. ..	250,000 00	250,000 00	..	..
		2,142,742 55	2,311,801 56	216,036 67 46,977 66	46,977 66
		Net increase		169,059 01	

2. As to the progress of the new works:

Taking the estimate of expenditure on new works in 1894 as a measure of the expenditure in future years, the "first phase" will be finished in 1899. With regard to the date of completing the "first phase," we beg to refer to our despatch No. 1, Confidential, of the 1st January, 1893, where we stated that the Council of Administration held the view that, as the time of transit through the Canal had been reduced below that contemplated by the International Technical Commission of 1884,

* No. 8.

in consequence of the introduction of the system of night transit by means of the electric light, there was not the same urgency for completing the "first phase" of the new work as at the date of the recommendations of the Commission, and that future expenditure on new works should bear some relation to the probable revenue of each year irrespective of those recommendations. The Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury concurred in this view so far as regarded the capital expenditure for 1893.

3. As to the intentions of the Company with regard to borrowing in 1894:

The actual expenditure on new works during 1892 was about 11,000,000 fr., and the balance remaining in hand on the Capital Account at the end of 1893 may be taken at about 3,000,000 fr. The Company intend to raise a further sum of 12,000,000 fr. by the issue of 3 per Cent. bonds this month.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 17.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Rosebery.—(Received March 15.)

(No. 8. Commercial.)

Paris, March 6, 1894.

My Lord,

WE have the honour to inform your Lordship that at the monthly meeting of the Directors of the Suez Canal Company this day the two vacancies on the Board, caused by the retirement of Lord Brassey and the death of M. Waddington, were filled up by the election of Sir Henry Calcraft, K.C.B., and M. Vergé.

M. Vergé is a large shareholder in the Suez Canal Company, and possesses qualifications and acquirements which will, no doubt, render his services valuable to the Company.

It is unnecessary for us to make any observations upon the fitness of Sir Henry Calcraft for the place upon the Board to which he has been elected at the recommendation of the British Commercial Directors.

Sir Henry Calcraft's and M. Vergé's appointments will require the sanction of the shareholders at their next general meeting, in conformity with the Statutes of the Company.

In consequence of the resignation by M. Ferdinand de Lesseps of his post as President Director of the Company, and M. Guichard, his successor, taking only the title of President, it was agreed at the same meeting of the Board that M. de Rouville, whose appointment as "Sous-Directeur" was notified in our despatch No. 19, Commercial, of the 5th September last, should be styled in future "Directeur." It was distinctly understood, however, in reference to observations made by us that this change will give him no additional power and imply no modification of his position as previously defined by the Board.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 18.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received March 15.)

(No. 9. Commercial.)

Paris, March 12, 1894.

My Lord,

WITH reference to our despatch No. 12 of the 15th August, 1892, to the Marquis of Salisbury, regarding the circulation, &c., of the service boats of the Egyptian Government in the Suez Canal, we have the honour to inform your Lordship that, after prolonged negotiations between the Egyptian Government and the Suez Canal Company's agents in Egypt, the former have submitted the draft of the letter, of which a copy is inclosed, with a view to a final settlement of this long outstanding question.

The point at issue has hitherto been whether the Company should allow exemption from tolls and gratuitous berthing to Egyptian vessels of war, apart from those Government vessels engaged in police and coast-guard services, involving a wide departure from the terms of the original Agreement, which confined the privilege to a single vessel.

Notwithstanding that the Egyptian Government now possess no vessels of war, as a matter of principle they have maintained their claim, but in the draft letter now under consideration the difficulty has been met by no express reference being made to the point; it being only stated that the interpretation to be given to Article IX of the Convention of the 2nd February, 1886, applies to the ships and boats of the Egyptian Government, "autres que ses bâtiments de guerre." The question, therefore, as to the privileges, if any, to be granted to war vessels remains in abeyance.

At the meeting of the Board of Directors on the 6th instant the matter came up for consideration, and, after some discussion, it was agreed to accept the proposal of the Egyptian Government in the terms of the letter to the Chief Agent of the Company in Cairo, of which we have the honour to inclose a copy.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 18.

Draft of Letter to Agent-General at Cairo.

M. l'Agent Supérieur,

LE Gouvernement Égyptien et la Compagnie du Canal Maritime de Suez sont tombés d'accord pour donner à l'Article IX de la Convention du 22 Février, 1866, l'interprétation définitive ci-après pour tout ce qui concerne la circulation, le transit, et le stationnement dans le Canal de Suez, des navires et embarcations du Gouvernement Égyptien, autres que ses bâtiments de guerre.

Les bateaux à vapeur, à voiles, ou à rames employés à assurer le long du Canal tous les services du Gouvernement, pourvu que le tonnage brut de chacun d'eux ne soit pas supérieur à 100 tonnes, peuvent librement circuler, transiter, ou stationner dans le dit Canal, sans être astreints au paiement d'un droit ou d'une taxe quelconque. La Compagnie devra délivrer des permis de circulation à la réquisition de l'Admniistration intéressée.

Il demeure entendu que l'ensemble du tonnage net total des bateaux auxquels cette exemption est reconnue ne pourra dépasser, à un moment quelconque, le chiffre de 1,500.

Quant aux croiseurs garde-côtes ou autres navires des services du Gouvernement Égyptien jaugeant plus de 100 tonneaux bruts, ils sont exempts de tous droits de transit entre Port-Saïd et Suez jusqu'à concurrence de 2,000 tonnes par an; mais ils devront se conformer à l'obligation de prendre à leur bord un pilote de la Compagnie et ne pourront changer de direction qu'à Ismaïlia ou dans les Lacs Amers.

Il est entendu que chacun de ces bateaux, s'il transite plusieurs fois dans la même année, entrera le même nombre de fois dans ce total pour son tonnage net, quel que soit le sens du transit effectué.

L'aller d'un port d'entrée du Canal à Ismaïlia, et vice versa, comptera comme un transit complet, ainsi que l'aller de Port Thewfik aux Lacs Amers et vice versa, tandis que l'aller de Pord-Saïd aux Lacs Amers et le retour à Port-Saïd compteront comme un double transit.

Ces mêmes navires sont exemptés du paiement des droits de stationnement dans les ports dépendant du Canal jusqu'à concurrence de 500 jours de stationnement gratuit par an, indépendamment de la gratuité du stationnement pour une durée de vingt-quatre heures reconnue à tous les navires. Ces 500 jours de stationnement s'appliquent à l'ensemble de ces navires, étant entendu que chacun de ces navires aura droit, en outre, comme il vient d'être dit, à la gratuité de stationnement pour une durée de vingt-quatre heures.

Enfin, il a été entendu que les croiseurs, navires, ou canots dont il vient d'être question, ne transporteront en aucun cas, ni passagers ni marchandises et demeureront

soumis à toutes les prescriptions du règlement de navigation auxquelles il n'est pas dérogé par le présent. Vous reconnaîtrez, je suis persuadé, M. l'Agent Supérieur, que ce sont bien là les termes de l'accord intervenu.

Veuillez, &c.

Inclosure 2 in No. 18.

Draft of Letter to Agent-General at Cairo.

M. l'Agent Supérieur,

EN réponse à votre lettre du 5 Février dernier, je m'empresse de vous informer que dans sa séance du 6 courant, le Conseil d'Administration a pris connaissance du projet de la lettre qui vous serait adressée par le Gouvernement Égyptien pour fixer les termes de l'accord sur le transit, la circulation, et le stationnement de bâtiments des services publics du Gouvernement en interprétation de l'Article IX de la Convention du 22 Février, 1866.

Le Conseil d'Administration vous autorise, à la réception de la lettre du Gouvernement, à lui faire connaître l'acceptation de la Compagnie, en ajoutant qu'il est bien entendu que l'exception qui est apportée aux droits qu'a la Compagnie d'exiger le péage de tout navire transiteur est strictement limitée aux termes de cet accord.

Votre lettre devra indiquer également la date de la mise en vigueur de l'accord, date qui sera celle de la lettre du Gouvernement en définissant les termes.

Veuillez, &c.
Le Président,

No. 19.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received April 5.)

(No. 11. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, April* 3, 1894.

WITH reference to our despatch No. 2 of the 22nd January last, we have the honour to transmit a copy of the reply we have received from the Lords of the Admiralty with regard to the question in dispute between their Lordships and the Suez Canal Company as to the right of mooring ships alongside land belonging to the Admiralty at Port Saïd.

We inclose also a copy of a letter we have addressed this day to their Lordships.

We have, &c.
(For the British Directors),
(Signed) H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 19.

Admiralty to Sir J. Stokes.

Sir, *Admiralty, March* 27, 1894.

WITH reference to the letter from the British Directors of the Suez Canal Company dated the 20th January last, I am commanded by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to acquaint you that it has been decided, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State for India, that the question in dispute with the Canal Company affecting the land belonging to the British Government at Port Saïd shall be settled by a conference to be held in Paris.

A further communication will shortly be addressed to you on the subject.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

Inclosure 2 in No. 19.

The British Suez Canal Directors to Admiralty.

Sir, *Paris, April* 3, 1894.

WE have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo, and to state that we have expressed to the President of the Suez Canal Company the readiness of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, in concurrence with the Secretary of State for India, to settle the matter in dispute with the Company by a conference to be held in Paris. The President is willing that the Company should take part in such Conference, and will be prepared to discuss the matter with such person as their Lordships may delegate for the purpose. We shall hold ourselves in readiness to assist him to the best of our influence and ability.

We await the further communication promised in your letter, and have, &c.

(For the British Directors),
(Signed) H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 20.

Treasury to Foreign Office.—(Received April 7.)

Sir, *Treasury Chambers, April* 6, 1894.

REFERRING to your letter of the 27th February and previous correspondence, I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to request you to inform the Secretary of State that they have had under consideration the question of the date from which the new arrangements for the remuneration of Mr. Austin Lee should take effect.

The natural date for this purpose would be that on which Mr. Austin Lee was appointed an ordinary member of the Managing Committee, viz., 13th February. But the fiscal year of the Suez Company begins on the 1st January, and Mr. Austin Lee has been paid his double salary from the Foreign Office and this Board under the old arrangement up to the 31st December last inclusive. My Lords, moreover, are given to understand that the fees earned by Mr. Lee between the 1st January and the 13th February do not materially differ in amount from the proportion of his former double salary for the two periods.

In view of all these considerations my Lords think that the most convenient course would be that the new arrangements should take effect from the 1st January last inclusive.

As to the dates and method of payment, on the one hand of his salary of 1,000*l.* per annum from public funds, and on the other of his contribution of 1,000*l.* per annum from fees, my Lords observe that only part of the distribution to be made in July next in respect of fees will go to Mr. Lee under the new arrangement, the balance being payable to the Exchequer under the former arrangement, in respect of meetings in 1893. After July there will be no distribution until January next. These facts, in their Lordships' opinion, justify them in meeting Mr. Lee's wishes by advancing to him 250*l.* a quarter (less income tax) from public funds in the same manner and on the same conditions as his former salary, provided that he repays the amount so advanced out of the fees received by him from the Suez Company at the first opportunity. In the current year my Lords believe that the fees receivable by him in July will not suffice to cover the two advances of 250*l.* which will have been made by that date, and the balance will fall to be made good out of the January distribution, but this difficulty will not arise in subsequent years.

If the Secretary of State concurs in these arrangements, he will perhaps be good enough to make the necessary communication to Mr. Austin Lee.

I am, &c.
(Signed) R. E. WELBY.

No. 21.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, April* 13, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Kimberley to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th instant respecting the date from which the new arrangements for Mr. Austin Lee's remuneration shall take effect, and I am to request that you will inform the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury in reply, that his Lordship concurs in the arrangement indicated in your letter.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GREY.

No. 22.

Foreign Office to Mr. Austin Lee.

Sir, *Foreign Office, April* 13, 1894.

WITH reference to my letter of the 27th February last respecting your position as a British Director of the Suez Canal Company, I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to transmit herewith a copy of a further letter from the Treasury respecting the date from which the new arrangements for your remuneration shall take effect.*

Lord Kimberley has signified his assent to the communication indicated in this letter.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GREY.

No. 23.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received May 3.)

(No. 12. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, May* 1, 1894.

WE have the honour to forward to your Lordship the Returns of the navigation through the Suez Canal for the year 1893, as compared with that of the two previous years 1891 and 1892.

The Returns are, as previously, comprised in nine Tables, and are in continuation of those inclosed in our despatch of the 18th April, 1893. The following is a brief summary of their contents :—

Table No. 1.—*A Monthly Return of the Shipping, Tonnage, and Transit Receipts for the years* 1891, 1892, *and* 1893.

The net tonnage for the past year shows a decrease of 52,960 tons as compared with that of 1892, and of 1,039,709 tons as compared with that of 1891.

The amount of dues has declined from 83,422,101 fr. in 1891, and 74,452,436 fr. in 1892, to 70,667,361 fr. in 1893.

Table No. 2.—*A Return of the Shipping and Tonnage for the same period of three years, arranged under their respective Flags.*

The number of vessels which passed through the Canal was 4,207 in 1891, 3,559 in 1892, and 3,341 in 1893, of which 3,217 in 1891, 2,581 in 1892, and 2,405 in 1893, carried the British flag.

Table No. 3.—*A Comparative Return of these three years, based on Table No.* 2, *and giving the Percentage of the Shipping and Tonnage of the Flags engaged.*

The percentage of British flags passing through the Suez Canal in 1893 shows a slight decrease as compared with the previous year, 72 per cent. carrying the British flag as against 72½ per cent. in 1892. The percentage of German and Italian vessels has remained nearly stationary, while there is an increase in that of French vessels from 4·89 to 5·69, and of Dutch vessels from 4·97 to 5·33.

* No. 20.

Table No. 4.—*A Return of the Shipping for the year* 1893, *arranged under its various Categories, Merchant-Vessels, Mail-Steamers, Ships-of-War, &c.*

In this Table the shipping is divided into the various classes of merchant-vessels, mail-steamers, war-ships and transports, Government chartered vessels, and vessels in ballast. Of 2,567 merchant-vessels and vessels in ballast, of a net tonnage of 5,676,941 tons, passing through the Canal, 2,133, of a net tonnage of 4,929,070 tons, were British, that is, nearly 83 per cent. of the number and 86 per cent. of the tonnage; and 190, or 8 per cent., were German vessels, whose tonnage was 6 per cent. of the whole; France, Holland, and Norway combined, furnishing a total of 7 per cent. of the vessels and 5·4 per cent. of the tonnage of the carrying trade to the East through the Suez Canal.

Table No. 5.—*A General Yearly Return of Vessels from the opening of the Canal to the present Time, showing their Gross and Net Tonnage, the Transit Receipts, and the mean Net Tonnage per Vessel.*

In the years 1881-91, the annual net tonnage ranged from 4,136,779 tons to 8,698,777 tons, and the transit receipts from 51,274,352 fr. to 83,422,101 fr.; the average of the net tonnage was 6,179,843 tons, and of the transit receipts was 63,459,028 fr.; while in 1893 the net tonnage amounted to 7,659,068 tons, and the transit receipts to 70,667,361 fr. The mean net tonnage per vessel also rose from 1,517 tons in 1881 to nearly 2,292 tons in 1893, being 125 tons per vessel in excess of 1892.

Table No. 6.—*A Monthly Return, showing the average Time occupied by Vessels in* 1893, *distinguishing those which navigated both by Night and Day from such as navigated by Day alone.*

The mean duration of passage for all vessels navigating the Canal shows a decrease from 21 hours 16 minutes in 1892 to 20 hours 45 minutes in 1893. In 1892 the percentage of vessels navigating by night was 90 per cent., while in 1893 it rose to 92·2 per cent., the number being 3,082 in 1893 as against 3,236 in 1892. The satisfactory manner in which the night service has been carried on again reflects great credit upon the Transit Department.

Table No. 7.—*A Return showing the Draught of Water of Vessels navigating the Canal during the last eight years, with the Percentage of such Draught.*

The percentage of vessels drawing less than 23 feet declined from 73·31 in 1892 to 68·93 in 1893, while vessels drawing more than 23 feet increased from 26·69 in 1892 to 31·07 in 1893.

The maximum draught allowed for vessels passing through the Canal is 25 feet 7 inches, and the increase in the size of vessels is shown in a remarkable manner by the fact that 164 vessels, drawing more than 24 feet 7 inches, used the Canal, as compared with 127 in 1892 and 135 in 1891, representing a percentage of 3·20 in 1891, 3·57 in 1892, and 4·91 in 1893.

Table No. 8.—*A Return of the Number of Passengers who passed through the Canal in* 1893.

There has been a diminution in the numbers of military and civilian passengers, but a considerable increase in the case of pilgrims and emigrants. The total numbers carried in 1893 amount to 180,432, as against 183,912 in 1892.

Table No. 9.—*A Return showing the Number of Passengers carried through the Suez Canal from its opening in* 1870 *to the year* 1893.

In the year 1870, 26,758 passengers were carried through the Canal; in 1880 the number had risen to 98,900, and in 1890 to 175,105; while in the past year it amounted to 180,432, as against 183,912 in 1892.

We have, &c.

(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 23.

(No. 1.)—MONTHLY RETURN of the Shipping and Tonnage that passed through the Suez Canal, together with the Transit Receipts for the years 1891, 1892, and 1893.

Month.	1891.				1892.				1893.			
	Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.	Transit Receipts.	Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.	Transit Receipts.	Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.	Transit Receipts.
		Tons.	Tons.	Fr. c.		Tons.	Tons.	Fr. c.		Tons.	Tons.	Fr. c.
January	303	907,126·849	641,187·045	6,248,235 23	322	954,925·980	674,862·490	6,418,468 88	317	979,898·730	699,043·840	6,378,972 94
February	304	847,931·820	597,827·360	5,789,284 89	327	948,989·240	677,288·950	6,395,181 56	241	781,188·100	554,848·934	5,118,517 71
March	376	1,088,780·170	776,742·770	7,494,812 56	378	1,141,014·300	811,119·800	7,777,651 02	313	992,819·660	707,698·240	6,518,581 66
April	391	1,100,883·670	784,150·770	7,453,344 98	363	1,074,921·682	766,495·611	7,345,259 22	301	969,239·417	693,143·354	6,389,347 12
May	434	1,276,318·750	914,235·670	8,511,614 04	344	1,019,081·982	727,986·969	6,984,914 10	332	1,024,580·130	730,171·890	6,847,371 30
June	394	1,088,733·490	779,683·340	7,352,293 47	305	925,745·440	657,691·120	6,372,245 29	292	953,316·480	668,748·750	6,109,057 93
July	424	1,228,067·430	878,937·610	8,310,310 21	274	847,710·110	603,597·430	5,840,569 87	268	879,125·190	628,987·264	5,739,377 34
August	322	940,939·840	673,216·120	6,456,694 99	256	777,593·180	554,203·210	5,412,242 65	278	879,034·404	624,609·274	5,836,621 40
September	339	983,272·921	699,786·971	6,866,149 61	250	791,324·341	559,661·609	5,469,243 37	244	808,024·401	575,983·684	5,312,177 84
October	326	982,806·620	698,341·150	6,784,561 11	249	808,856·480	570,710·050	5,573,996 09	272	879,036·420	624,859·990	5,770,385 71
November	293	900,997·270	635,818·320	6,186,003 04	238	762,598·323	535,139·291	5,227,749 62	222	739,457·020	520,862·300	4,846,350 93
December	291	872,107·567	618,549·834	5,968,497 11	253	813,340·410	573,261·030	5,634,923 36	261	838,078·203	630,110·735	5,800,399 55
Total	4,207	12,217,986·417	8,698,777·360	83,422,101 24	3,559	10,866,401·468	7,712,028·610	74,452,436 03	3,341	10,753,798·155	7,659,068·105	70,667,361 43

Inclosure 2 in No. 23.

(No. 2.)—Return showing the Number of Vessels and Tonnage that passed through the Suez Canal during the years 1891, 1892, and 1893, arranged under their respective Flags.

Flag.	1891.			1892.			1893.		
	Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.	Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.	Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.
		Tons.	Tons.		Tons.	Tons.		Tons.	Tons.
Great Britain	3,217	9,494,608·650	6,837,665·330	2,581	8,101,904·000	5,826,861·650	2,405	7,977,727·700	5,752,934·350
Germany	318	870,548·134	596,157·347	292	809,013·380	553,915·080	272	798,929·440	535,750·830
France	171	616,964·213	407,147·493	174	635,895·280	415,973·238	190	702,634·251	461,197·291
Holland	147	369,546·840	268,877·110	177	433,542·780	319,563·483	178	443,147·544	327,465·244
Italy	116	275,861·050	179,669·950	74	198,205·810	127,998·030	67	183,492·210	119,827·920
Austria-Hungary	51	169,399·360	112,172·240	61	191,144·278	124,655·049	71	251,467·840	166,279·450
Spain	28	99,627·320	69,127·090	26	98,240·240	68,580·100	29	100,706·060	70,660·420
Norway	55	114,016·460	84,376·840	66	146,524·610	108,349·090	50	119,615·640	88,674·920
Russia	21	64,554·380	39,022·780	22	74,553·520	43,750·600	28	82,767·340	53,548·440
Turkey	40	60,019·370	41,591·400	43	66,239·650	46,703·470	34	55,466·760	39,601·920
Egypt	1	294·350	132·450	2	2,462·400	1,569·900	5	7,466·120	4,441·670
Japan	6	12,794·380	7,904·730	3	5,941·410	3,726·600	1	2,846·630	1,280·980
Portugal	29	74,798·060	50,596·300	23	74,830·840	50,932·910	10	17,398·710	11,399·130
Belgium	..	..	..	4	7,429·970	5,131·700	1	2,546·240	1,761·310
Greece	5	4,570·730	3,245·650	6	13,845·180	10,074·780	..	..	..
America	1	619·470	389·200	2	1,253·420	564·020	3	6,526·330	3,200·200
China	..	..	..	2	3,455·380	2,388·920	..	..	..
Denmark	1	963·430	701·450	..	..	..	..	..	..
Brazil	..	..	..	..	2,228·600	1,279·990	1	1,119·350	634·930
Siam	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..
Hawaii	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals	4,207	12,217,986·417	8,698,777·360	3,559	10,866,401·468	7,712,028·610	3,341	10,753,798·155	7,659,068·105

Inclosure 3 in No. 23.

(No. 3.)—Return showing the Percentage of the Shipping and Tonnage of all Flags that passed through the Suez Canal during the years 1891, 1892, and 1893.

Flag.	1891.			1892.			1893.		
	Percentage of Vessels.	Percentage of Gross Tonnage.	Percentage of Net Tonnage.	Percentage of Vessels.	Percentage of Gross Tonnage.	Percentage of Net Tonnage.	Percentage of Vessels.	Percentage of Gross Tonnage.	Percentage of Net Tonnage.
Great Britain	76·47	77·63	78·69	72·52	74·56	75·55	71·98	74·18	75·11
Germany	7·56	7·12	6·85	8·20	7·44	7·18	8·14	7·43	7·26
France	4·07	5·05	4·69	4·89	5·85	5·39	5·69	6·53	6·02
Holland	3·49	3·02	3·09	4·97	3·99	4·14	5·33	4·12	4·27
Italy	2·76	2·26	2·07	2·08	1·82	1·66	2·00	1·71	1·56
Austria-Hungary ..	1·21	1·39	1·29	1·71	1·76	1·62	2·12	2·34	2·18
Spain	0·67	0·81	0·79	0·73	0·90	0·89	0·87	0·94	0·92
Norway	1·31	0·93	0·97	1·85	1·35	1·40	1·50	1·11	1·16
Russia	0·50	0·53	0·45	0·62	0·69	0·57	0·72	0·77	0·70
Turkey	0·95	0·49	0·48	1·21	0·61	0·60	1·02	0·52	0·52
Egypt	0·02	(0·002)	(0·001)	0·06	0·02	0·02	0·15	0·07	0·06
Japan	0·14	0·10	0·09	0·08	0·05	0·05	0·03	0·03	0·02
Portugal	0·69	0·61	0·58	0·65	0·69	0·66	0·30	0·16	0·15
Belgium	..	..	..	0·11	0·07	0·07	0·03	0·02	0·02
Greece	0·12	0·04	0·04	0·17	0·13	0·14	..	..	..
America	0·02	0·01	(0·004)	0·06	0·01	0·01	0·09	0·06	0·04
China	..	..	..	0·06	0·03	0·03	..	..	..
Denmark	0·02	0·01	0·01	..	..	..	..	..	..
Brazil	..	..	..	..	..	..	0·03	0·01	0·01
Siam	..	..	..	0·03	0·03	0·02	..	..	..
Hawaii	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals ..	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Inclosure 4 in No. 23.

(No. 4.)—Return of Shipping and Tonnage that passed through the Suez Canal during the year 1893, arranged under their respective Flags and Categories.

Flag.	Merchant Vessels.		Mail Steamers.		War Ships and Transports.		Government-chartered Vessels.		Vessels in Ballast.		Totals.	
	No.	Net Tonnage.	No.	Net Tonnage.	No.	Net Tonnage.	No.	Net Tonnage.	No.	Net Tonnage.	No.	Net Tonnage.
		Tons.		Tons.		Tons.		Tons.		Tons.		Tons.
Great Britain	2,123	4,910,980·49	233	740,316·35	38	80,399·41	1	2,547·73	10	19,090·33	2,405	5,752,934·350
Germany	190	310,189·07	79	195,166·39	3	1,374·97	...	...	...	...	272	535,750·830
France	60	101,979·74	100	279,729·32	14	38,004·611	15	42,162·07	1	321·85	190	461,197·291
Holland	74	116,418·39	102	208,720·27	2	326·294	...	...	...	...	178	327,465·244
Italy	5	8,338·50	52	105,649·56	8	3,607·06	...	...	2	2,232·70	67	119,827·920
Austria-Hungary ...	20	35,903·72	48	128,127·72	3	2,746·61	...	...	...	...	71	166,779·450
Spain	2	660·96	27	69,999·14	...	...	...	...	...	...	29	70,660·420
Portugal	2	1,235·16	5	8,109·21	2	1,121·11	...	...	1	743·65	10	11,399·130
Norway	30	88,674·92	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	50	88,674·920
Russia	...	...	19	49,798·18	5	3,750·26	...	...	...	...	24	53,548·440
Turkey	17	20,561·65	...	...	1	507·14	13	16,070·24	3	2,162·80	34	39,601·920
Japan	...	...	...	...	1	1,280·98	...	...	...	...	1	1,280·980
Belgium	1	1,761·31	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,761·310
America	...	...	...	...	3	3,274·90	...	...	1	825·30	3	3,200·200
Brazil	...	...	...	...	1	634·93	...	...	...	...	1	634·930
Egypt	3	1,593·49	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	2,848·18	5	4,441·670
Totals	3,548	5,649,097·27	665	1,785,216·58	80	136,130·083	29	60,780·16	21	27,324·23	3,341	7,659,068·105

Inclosure 5 in No. 23.

(No. 5.)—YEARLY RETURN of Shipping and Tonnage that passed through the Suez Canal from its opening until the year 1893, together with the Transit Receipts.

Year.	Number of Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.	Transit Receipts.	Mean Net Tonnage per Vessel.
				Fr. c.	
1869	10	10,557·61	6,576·00	54,460 80	657
1870	486	654,915·02	436,609·37	5,159,327 22	898
1871	765	1,142,200·46	761,467·05	8,993,732 87	995
1872	1,082	1,744,481·32	1,160,743·54	16,407,591 42	1,071
1873	1,173	2,085,072·61	1,367,767·82	22,897,319 18	1,166
1874	1,264	2,423,672·22	1,631,650·14	24,859,383 00	1,290
1875	1,494	2,940,708·45	2,009,984·09	28,886,302 27	1,345
1876	1,457	3,072,107·01	2,096,771·61	29,974,998 74	1,439
1877	1,663	3,418,949·72	2,355,447·69	32,774,344 22	1,416
1878	1,593	3,291,535·38	2,269,678·31	31,098,229 18	1,425
1879	1,477	3,236,942·32	2,263,332·19	29,686,060 81	1,532
1880	2,026	4,344,519·89	3,057,421·88	39,840,487 64	1,509
1881	2,727	5,794,491·19	4,136,779·77	51,274,352 95	1,517
1882	3,198	7,122,125·68	5,074,808·88	60,545,882 08	1,586
1883	3,307	8,051,307·30	5,775,861·79	65,847,812 16	1,746
1884	3,284	8,319,967·36	5,871,500·92	62,378,115 54	1,787
1885	3,624	8,985,411·80	6,335,752·98	62,207,439 21	1,748
1886	3,100	8,183,313·15	5,767,655·84	56,527,390 58	1,860
1887	3,137	8,430,043·20	5,903,024·09	57,862,370 71	1,881
1888	3,440	9,437,957·32	6,640,834·44	64,832,273 20	1,930
1889	3,425	9,605,745·48	6,783,187·12	66,167,579 14	1,951
1890	3,389	9,749,129·09	6,890,094·41	66,984,000 22	2,033
1891	4,207	12,217,986·41	8,698,777·36	83,422,101 24	2,067
1892	3,559	10,866,401·468	7,712,028·61	74,452,436 03	2,166·90
1893	3,341	10,753,728·155	7,659,068·105	70,667,361 43	2,292·447

Inclosure 6 in No. 23.

(No. 6.)—MONTHLY RETURN of Vessels for 1893, giving their Mean Duration of Passage of such as navigated by Night, as compared with those navigating by Day only.

Month.	Mean Duration of Passage.					
	For Vessels navigating by Night as well as by Day.		For Vessels navigating by Day only.		For all Vessels.	
	Number of Vessels.	Duration.	Number of Vessels.	Duration.	Number of Vessels.	Duration.
		Hrs. m.		Hrs. m.		Hrs. m.
January	299	23 28	18	44 37	317	24 40
February	225	18 39	16	27 31	241	19 14
March	293	20 58	20	34 40	313	21 50
April	286	19 34	15	26 56	301	19 56
May	287	18 50	45	27 4	332	19 57
June	269	18 59	23	29 54	292	19 51
July	244	18 47	24	28 15	268	19 38
August	247	20 46	31	31 6	278	21 55
September	228	18 33	16	27 50	244	19 9
October	249	19 47	23	35 49	272	21 9
November	209	19 58	13	38 1	222	21 1
December	246	19 12	15	31 59	261	19 56
Totals, and total mean duration ..	3,082	19 52	259	31 24	3,341	20 45

Inclosure 7 in No. 23.

(No. 7.)—RETURN showing the Draught of Water of Vessels that passed through the Suez Canal for the years 1886 to 1893, inclusive.

Year.		Vessels having a Draught of Water of—									Total Number of Vessels.
		Less than 7 metres. (22 ft. 11 in.)	7·01 to 7·10 metres. (23 ft. 3 in.)	7·11 to 7·20 metres. (23 ft. 7 in.)	7·21 to 7·30 metres. (23 ft. 11 in.)	7·31 to 7·40 metres. (24 ft. 3 in.)	7·41 to 7·50 metres. (24 ft. 7 in.)	7·51 to 7·60 metres. (24 ft. 11 in.)	7·61 to 7·70 metres. (25 ft. 3 in.)	7·71 to 7·80 metres. (25 ft. 7 in.)	
1886 ..	Number	2,426	190	143	112	125	104	..	..	..	3,100
	Percentage	78·26	6·13	4·61	3·61	4·03	3·36				
1887 ..	Number	2,359	139	173	109	151	156	..	..	..	3,187
	Percentage	75·19	6·03	5·52	3·48	4·81	4·97				
1888 ..	Number	2,469	223	197	122	147	282	..	..	..	3,440
	Percentage	71·77	6·48	5·73	3·55	4·27	8·20				
1889 ..	Number	2,436	236	218	122	149	264	..	..	..	3,425
	Percentage	71·12	6·89	6·37	3·56	4·35	7·71				
1890 ..	Number	2,395	230	189	87	165	178	53	48	44	3,389
	Percentage	70·67	6·79	5·58	2·57	4·87	5·25	1·56	1·41	1·30	
1891 ..	Number	3,187	241	208	135	182	119	54	46	35	4,207
	Percentage	75·76	5·73	4·94	3·21	4·33	2·83	1·28	1·09	0·83	
1892 ..	Number	2,609	225	201	120	174	103	51	44	32	3,559
	Percentage	73·31	6·32	5·65	3·37	4·89	2·89	1·43	1·24	0·90	
1893 ..	Number	2,303	251	213	109	188	113	60	48	56	3,341
	Percentage	68·93	7·51	6·38	3·26	5·63	3·38	1·79	1·44	1·68	

N.B.—On and after April 15, 1890, vessels were allowed to pass through the Canal with a draught of water of 7·80 metres = 25 ft. 7 in.

Inclosure 8 in No. 23.

(No. 8.)—RETURN showing the Number of Passengers both Outward and Homeward Bound, exclusive of Ships' Crews, that passed through the Suez Canal during the years 1892 and 1893.

Classification.	1892.			1893.		
	Outward Bound.	Homeward Bound.	Totals.	Outward Bound.	Homeward Bound.	Totals.
Military—						
English	19,763½	16,314	36,077½	14,681	13,453	28,134
French	6,885	6,989	13,874	7,711	6,357	14,068
Italian	1,820	1,958	3,778	1,570	1,564	3,134
Turkish	16,157	9,839	25,996	6,909	8,049	14,958
Russian	2,551	2,745	5,296	2,222	942	3,164
Dutch	1,889	1,236	3,125	2,261	3,003	5,264
Spanish	885	709	1,594	1,448	296	1,744
German	537	658	1,195	307	404	711
Japanese	..	188	188	..	197	197
Portuguese	228	392	620	374	132	506
Military total	50,715½	41,028	91,743½	37,483	34,397	71,880
Civilians	38,274½	31,964½	70,239½	32,149½	35,113	67,262½
Pilgrims, emigrants, and convicts ..	11,124½	10,805	21,929½	24,373	16,917	41,290
Totals	100,114½	83,797½	183,912½	94,005½	86,427	180,432½

Inclosure 9 in No. 23.

(No. 9.)—RETURN showing the Number of Passengers carried through the Suez Canal from its opening to the year 1893.

Year.	Military.	Civilians.	Pilgrims, Emigrants, and Convicts.	Total Passengers on Vessels.	Total Passengers on Boats.	Total.
1870	..	..	..	26,758	..	..
1871	..	..	..	48,422	..	..
1872	..	..	..	67,640	..	..
1873	..	..	..	68,030	..	..
1874	..	..	..	73,597	..	..
1875	..	..	..	84,446	..	..
1876*	30,420	20,832	8,362	59,614	..	..
1877	39,463	24,400	8,949	72,821	..	..
1878	58,274	26,170	11,919	96,363	..	..
1879	42,775	26,697	12,672	82,144	..	..
1880	49,493	29,139	20,268	98,900	..	..
1881	43,163	35,604	8,039	86,806	..	..
1882	62,898	38,288	20,686	121,872	..	..
1883	47,919	36,149	31,529	115,597†	3,579	119,176
1884	74,318	39,987	34,993	148,298	3,618	151,916
1885	112,230	47,068	42,473	201,771	4,178	205,949
1886	84,593	55,320	27,709	167,622	3,788	171,410
1887	91,966	53,414	33,405	178,785	4,211	182,996
1888	87,131	63,103	29,231	179,465	4,430	183,895
1889	75,445	72,192	27,868	175,505	5,087	180,592
1890	67,767	69,479	18,430	155,676	5,676	161,352
1891	93,780	73,562	20,784	188,126	6,347	194,473
1892	91,743	70,239	21,929	183,912	5,907	189,820
1893	71,880	67,262	41,290	180,432	..	..

* The distinction has only been made since 1876.
† Until 1883 the passengers on boats were included in the total of passengers on vessels.

No. 24.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received May 16.)

Admiralty, May 16, 1894.

Sir,

I AM commanded by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to state, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that certain questions have arisen with the Suez Canal Company with respect to rights claimed by the Company to berth ships on the frontage of the land at Port Saïd held by the British Government other than that facing the Maritime Canal.

The points at which the Admiralty and the Company are at issue have formed the subject of a correspondence that has extended over several years, without any satisfactory conclusion being come to, and my Lords have, in the hope of settling the question finally, acceded, with the concurrence of the India Office, to a suggestion by M. Ch. de Lesseps and the British Directors of the Suez Canal, that a Conference should be held in Paris to arrange the matters in dispute.

The officer who has been appointed to represent the Admiralty and the Indian Government is Rear-Admiral Ernest Rice, who was selected as the Representative of the Admiralty in the case of a previous and somewhat similar Convention in 1886.

I am to request that the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava may be acquainted accordingly, and requested to afford Admiral Rice any facilities he may require in the execution of this duty.

The date of the Conference has not yet been fixed, but a further communication will be made to you when it shall have been settled.

I am, &c.
(Signed) R. D. AWDRY.

No. 25.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received May 19.)

Admiralty, May 18, 1894.

Sir,

WITH reference to Admiralty letter of the 16th May, 1894, I am commanded by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to state that the Conference between Rear-Admiral Ernest Rice, as Representative of the Admiralty, and the Indian Government, and the British Directors of the Suez Canal Company therein referred to, is to be held in Paris early next week.

I am to request that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will be so good as to cause the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava to be acquainted accordingly.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

No. 26.

The Earl of Kimberley to the Marquis of Dufferin.

(No. 53. Commercial.)

Foreign Office, May 19, 1894.

My Lord,

I INCLOSE a copy of a letter from the Admiralty,* stating that Rear-Admiral Rice has been appointed to represent their Lordships and the Indian Government at a forthcoming Conference with the Directors of the Suez Canal respecting the land at Port Saïd which belongs to Her Majesty's Government.

I have to request your Excellency to afford to Admiral Rice any facilities which he may require in the execution of this duty.

I am, &c.
(Signed) KIMBERLEY.

P.S.—I have since learned from the Admiralty that the Conference will be held in Paris early next week.

K.

No. 27.

The British Directors of Suez Canal to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received May 24.)

(No. 13. Commercial.)

Paris, May 23, 1894.

My Lord,

WE have the honour to report that the 5th June is the date fixed for the annual general meeting of the shareholders of the Suez Canal Company.

In order that Her Majesty's Government may be represented at this meeting, we have to request that we may be provided with the usual certificate from the Permanent Secretary of Her Majesty's Treasury, stating that the Suez Canal shares purchased by Great Britain still remain in the possession of Her Majesty's Government.

We shall be glad to receive this certificate as soon as it can conveniently be obtained.

We have further to request that instructions may be sent to Her Majesty's Secretary of Embassy in Paris in the event of his being nominated to act as the Representative of Her Majesty's Government at the meeting.

We have, &c.
(For the British Directors),
(Signed) H. AUSTIN LEE.

* No. 24.

No. 28.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, May* 25, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Kimberley to state that he has been informed by the British Directors on the Council of the Suez Canal Company that the annual general meeting of the shareholders will take place on the 5th proximo, and I am to request, with a view to the representation of Her Majesty's Government at this meeting, that you will move the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to cause his Lordship to be furnished with the usual certificate stating that the shares purchased by Great Britain, or the deposit certificates issued in lieu of the drawn shares, still remain in the possession of Her Majesty's Government.

The British Directors ask that this certificate may be sent to them as soon as possible, and it should be in their hands not later than the 1st proximo.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GREY.

No. 29.

Treasury to Foreign Office.—(Received May 29.)

Sir, *Treasury Chambers, May* 29, 1894.

IN reply to your letter of the 25th instant, I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to transmit to you, to be laid before the Earl of Kimberley, a certificate* signed by their Lordships' Permanent Secretary as to the continued possession of the Suez Canal shares by Her Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) FRANCIS MOWATT.

No. 30.

The British Directors of Suez Canal to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received May 29.)

(No. 15. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Paris, May* 26, 1894.

WE have the honour to report that on the 21st instant we attended meetings of the Finance Committee and Council of the Suez Canal Company, at which the accounts for the year 1893, as finally adjusted, were examined and passed, preparatory to their submission to the general meeting of the shareholders on the 5th June.

	Fr.	c.
The total receipts from all sources for the year ended 31st December, 1893, amounted to	73,844,058	53
To which is added the Special Reserve of	1,500,000	00
The nature and object of which were explained in our despatches of the 20th May, 1892, and the 3rd February, 1894; and also the excess of the Statutory Reserve of 5,000,000 fr., viz. .. .. .. (Both these reserve sums being added to the amount available for dividend in the interest of the "Délégataires" whose connection with the Company ceases at the 1st July, 1894.)	1,235,933	49
	76,579,992	02
Total expenses, including 5 per cent. interest on the share capital	35,964.455	28
Showing a net profit of	40,615,536	74

Of which 71 per cent. is distributable among the shareholders. The gross amount of interest and dividend combined per share is 97·092 fr., or after deduction of taxes 90·373 fr. The rate for the year 1892 was 99·068 fr. gross and 92·366 fr. net.

It will be seen that the figures of the corrected accounts for 1893 differ very slightly from the estimate which we had the honour to submit in our despatch of the 3rd February last.

The Annual Report which will be presented to the shareholders on the 5th June, and of which we shall have the honour to forward copies to your Lordship, contains

* Not printed.

details of the various heads of expenditure and revenue, but we think it interesting to state in our present despatch that the receipts in respect of the transit of vessels through the Canal were 3,750,349 fr. 76 c. less in 1893 than in 1892, but that no less than 3,739,537 fr. 47 c. of this amount is attributable to the reduction of the tariff from 9 fr. 50 c. to 9 fr. on the 1st January, 1893. It may be added that the transit receipts from the 1st January to the 25th May of the present year show an increase of over 800,000 fr. = 32,000*l.* as compared with the corresponding period for 1893, viz.:—

	Fr.
1893	30,890,000
1894	30,080,000

We have, &c.
(Signed) C. RIVERS WILSON.
J. STOKES.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 31.

The Earl of Kimberley to the Marquis of Dufferin.

(No. 59. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Foreign Office, May* 29, 1894.

I AM informed by the British Directors on the Council of the Suez Canal Company that the annual general meeting of the shareholders of that Company will take place on the 6th proximo.

It is the desire of Her Majesty's Government that the First Secretary of Her Majesty's Embassy, or, in his absence, the Senior Second Secretary, should attend the meeting to represent them as on former occasions, and I have to request your Excellency to instruct Mr. Phipps or Mr. Hardinge accordingly.

I inclose a certificate under the hand of the Permanent Secretary of the Treasury,* to the effect that the shares of the Suez Canal Company purchased by Great Britain, or the deposit certificates issued in lieu of the drawn shares, still remain in the possession of Her Majesty's Government.

This document should be produced at the office of the Suez Canal Company five clear days before the date fixed for the annual general meeting.

I am, &c.
(Signed) KIMBERLEY.

No. 32.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, June* 1, 1894.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, to be laid before the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, the accompanying copy of a despatch from the British Directors of the Suez Canal Company respecting meetings of the Finance Committee and Council of the Company.†

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GREY.

No. 33.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received June 14.)

(No. 16. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Paris, June* 5, 1894.

WE have this day attended the general meeting of shareholders of the Suez Canal Company, and have the honour to inclose copies of the Report which was read to them.‡

* Inclosure in No. 29 (not printed). † No. 30. ‡ Not printed.

The Report contains the usual information as to the receipts and expenditure, the maintenance of the waterway, and particulars as to the various establishments of the Company, together with Statistical Returns, of which the most important are included in our despatch No. 12, Commercial, of the 1st ultimo.

We would call your Lordship's attention, in connection with the correspondence on the subject of the interest due by Egypt on the purchase-money of the Suez Canal shares after December 1893, to a claim made by the holders of delegations to a share in the profits of the Company accruing between the 1st January and the 30th June, 1894, as set forth on p. 7 of the Report. The Company are informed by their legal advisers that this claim is not valid, and the parties interested have been so informed, but it is possible that the matter may give rise to legal proceedings.

The principal matters on the order of the day for the decision of the shareholders were:—

1. A proposal for insuring to the family of M. de Lesseps a provision which the misfortunes of the last few years have rendered necessary, and to which, in the opinion of the Council, the founder of the Suez Canal is entitled at the hands of the shareholders, who have reaped such a rich harvest from his work.

2. The election of Directors to replace M. Waddington and Sir William Mackinnon, deceased, and Lord Brassey, retired.

3. The re-election of four Directors who retired by rotation after eight years' service, viz.: Lieutenant-General Sir John Stokes, M. Charles A. de Lesseps, M. Patinot, and Sir E. S. Dawes (who had filled Sir William Mackinnon's vacancy).

The usual criticisms were made on the proceedings of the Council of Administration, and were directed principally against the expenditure on the Canal, the recently constructed tramway, and the mode in which was proposed to make provision for M. de Lesseps' family. A violent attack was also made upon M. Charles de Lesseps by one of the speakers.

The President refuted the accusations of undue expenditure in an able speech of some length; one of his arguments in defence of the Council being that the holder of 176,602 shares, specially represented on the Council, would not countenance extravagant or unnecessary outlay, even were it not in the interest of every Director to restrain expenditure, as each, being himself a shareholder, was interested directly in the net profits being as large as possible.

M. Charles de Lesseps addressed to the meeting a calm and dignified reply to the attack which had been made upon him, and entirely carried the assembly with him.

The Resolutions approving the Report of the Council, the Auditors' Report, and the proposed dividend were carried almost unanimously, as were also the Resolutions nominating the Auditors for 1894, and confirming the appointments of M. Vergé, Sir Edwyn Dawes, and Sir Henry Calcraft.

The proposals in favour of M. de Lesseps' family were carried by 1,299 votes against 486.

The four outgoing Directors, Sir John Stokes, MM. Charles de Lesseps and Patinot, and Sir E. Dawes, were re-elected by 1,699, 1,120, 1,685, and 1,682 votes respectively, only 456 being given to the Baron Delort de Gléon, one of the prominent dissentients, and 10 to M. Brunel, an old employé of the Company.

On the special question brought forward by certain shareholders as to the removal of certain Directors, 364 votes were given against M. Victor de Lesseps, 84 against M. Peghoux, and 54 against M. Charles de Lesseps.

We inclose a report published by the "Journal des Débats" of the proceedings at the general meeting.*

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

---

* Not printed.

No. 34.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received June 19.)

(No. 17. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, June* 10, 1894.

WITH reference to the Resolution for granting a pension to the family of M. Ferdinand de Lesseps, which was submitted by the Council of Administration to the shareholders for their approval at the general meeting held on the 5th instant, and carried by a majority of 1,299 to 486 votes, we have the honour to inform your Lordship that this proposal met with the unanimous support of both the French and English Commercial Directors.

The manner in which the pension of 120,000 fr. (4,800*l.*) will be distributed among M. de Lesseps' family is fully stated on p. 4 of the Report inclosed in our despatch No. 16 of the 5th instant.

The Council, "to show their appreciation of M. Ferdinand de Lesseps' services," agreed to pay the heavy charges payable to the Government in connection with the deed assigning this pension. These charges will amount to about 145,000 fr. (5,800*l.*) in all.

In addition to this amount, the Council of Administration, as reported in our despatch No. 6 of February last, has made certain allowances to M. Ferdinand de Lesseps and his two sons in view of their incomes from the Company having been attached by the Liquidator of the Panamá Canal Company's estate. The total amount payable up to the end of June, when the new arrangement will come into force, amounts to 100,000 fr. (4,000*l.*), of which 15,000 fr. (600*l.*) will be deducted from the Administrators' fees for last year, and 85,000 fr. (3,400*l.*) from the fees accruing in the current half-year. The total amount, therefore, for which the Council have made themselves responsible will amount to 245,000 fr. (9,800*l.*). As the incomes of M. Ferdinand de Lesseps and his two sons, as well as that of M. Peghoux, have been attached, this amount will have to be shared by only twenty-eight out of the thirty-two Directors.

It is proposed that the payment shall be made *pro ratâ* in instalments, but no definite decision has yet been arrived at in the matter.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 35.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received June 19.)

(No. 18. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, June* 11, 1894.

WE have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith a Return drawn up by the Suez Canal Company, showing the groundings in the Suez Canal in the year 1893, with the names of the ships which grounded, and those of their owners, and the length of period during which the passage of the Canal was stopped in consequence of these accidents.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure in No. 35.

RETURN drawn up by the Suez Canal Company, showing the Groundings in the Suez Canal in the Year 1893.

Armateurs des Navires.	Nombre total de Navires ayant transité. — A.	Nombre d'Échouages de ces Navires. — B.	Pourcentage correspondant pour chaque Armateur. — B. × 100 / A.	Décomposition des Échouages. de 30 m. à 1 h.	de 1 h. à 2 h.	de 2 h. à 3 h.	de 3 h. à 6 h.	de 6 h. à 9 h.	de 9 h. à 12 h.	de 12 h. à 24 h.	au-dessus de 24 h.	Total des durées d'Échouages. — C.	Moyenne des durées d'Échouages. — C. / B.	Nombre 0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Armateurs dont les navires ont effectué un minimum de vingt-quatre traversées—												h. m.	h. m.							
Alexander, R. and Co.	66	1	1·52	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2 15	2 15	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Amirauté Anglaise	41	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bedouin Steam Navigation Company	33	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bibby Brothers	26	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
British India Steam Navigation Company	69	4	5·80	1	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	26 49	6 42	1	2	...	...	...	...	...
Brocklebank, T. J.	27	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cayzer, Irvine, and Co.	113	3	2·65	1	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	17 19	5 49	1	...	...	...	1	...	1
China Mutual Steam Navigation Company	40	1	2·50	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1 33	1 33	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
Cie. Transatlantique	28	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Deutsche Ost Afrika Linie	29	1	3·45	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	8 45	8 45	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Florio Rubattino	56	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Greenshields, Cowie, and Co.	27	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hamburg Calcutta Linie	29	2	6·90	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	5 32	2 46	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hamilton, Fraser, and Co.	26	2	7·69	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	11 35	5 47	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
Hansa (Dampf. Gesellschaft)	56	4	7·14	...	...	1	...	2	...	...	1	53 19	13 20	...	1	1	1	...	...	1
Harrison, T. and J.	58	1	1·72	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	3 29	3 29	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Henderson Brothers	60	3	5·75	...	...	1	1	...	1	...	...	16 21	5 27	...	2	...	...	1	...	...
Holt, Alfred	149	9	6·08	2	2	2	3	...	...	...	...	21 56	2 26	6	3	...	...	...	...	...
Jenkins and Co.	29	1	3·45	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0 35	0 35	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
Lloyd Autrichien	60	2	3·33	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	7 0	3 30	1	...	1	...	...	...	...
MacGregor, Gow, and Co.	36	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Messageries Maritimes	105	3	2·86	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	29 57	9 52	1	1	...	...	1	...	...
Nederland (Stoomvaart Maatschappij)	66	1	1·51	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	33 28	33 28	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Norddeutscher Lloyd	53	1	1·89	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	35 50	35 50	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
Orient Line	56	1	1·78	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	17 45	17 45	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
Cie. Péninsulaire et Orientale	193	7	3·63	3	1	...	3	...	...	...	...	17 26	2 29	5	1	...	...	1	...	...
Rankin, Gilmour	33	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rhederei (Deutsche Dampfschiffe)	34	1	1·65	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	16 45	16 45	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
R. Sapner and Co.	43	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rotterdam Lloyd	60	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Samuel, Marcus	29	2	6·90	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1 23	0 41	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
Smith and Sons, G.	91	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Th. Wilson, Sons, and Co.	27	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Wood, J. M.	24	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Totaux et Moyennes	1,906	50	2·62	12	6	6	11	6	2	4	3	328 51	6 35	21	13	4	1	6	...	2
2. Armateurs dont les navires n'ont pas effectué un minimum de 24 traversées. Ensemble 239 armateurs	1,433	84	5·86	27	22	4	12	5	3	6	5	472 56	5 26	36	25	3	5	4	1	1
Total	3,341	134	4·01	39	28	10	23	11	5	10	8	801 47	5 59	57	38	7	6	10	1	2

Armateurs des Navires.	Nombre de Navires arrêtés par Échouage. 7	8	9	10	11	15	20	22	Total des Navires arrêtés. — D.	Moyenne des Navires arrêtés par Échouage. — D. / B.	Durée maxima des Arrêts imposés à la Navigation. au-dessous de 1 h.	de 1 h. à 2 h.	de 2 h. à 3 h.	de 3 h. à 4 h.	de 4 h. à 5 h.	de 5 h. à 6 h.	de 6 h. à 7 h.	de 7 h. à 8 h.	de 8 h. à 9 h.	de 9 h. à 10 h.	de 10 h. à 11 h.	de 11 h. à 12 h.	de 12 h. à 18 h.	de 18 h. à 24 h.	au-dessus de 24 h.	Total des Échouages ayant arrêté des Navires. — E.	Total des durées des arrêts imposés. — F.	Moyenne des durées d'arrêts. — F. / D.	Moyenne définitive par Armateur. — F. / A. Temps exprimé en Minutes.
1. Armateurs dont les navires ont effectué un minimum de vingt-quatre traversées—																											h. m.	h. m.	h. m.
Alexander, R. and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Amirauté Anglaise	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bedouin Steam Navigation Company	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bibby Brothers	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
British India Steam Navigation Company	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	10	2·50	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	3	35 25	5 33	0 48
Brocklebank, T. J.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cayzer, Irvine, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	10	3·33	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	45 34	4 23	0 24
China Mutual Steam Navigation Company	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1 33	1 33	0 2
Cie. Transatlantique	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Deutsche Ost Afrika Linie	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Florio Rubattino	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Greenshields, Cowie, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hamburg Calcutta Linie	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hamilton, Fraser, and Co.	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	10	5	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	49 56	4 54	1 53
Hansa (Dampf. Gesellschaft)	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	13	3	...	2	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	18 28	1 32	0 29
Harrison, T. and J.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	4	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	9 2	2 15	0 9
Henderson Brothers	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	2	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	29 7	4 41	0 21
Holt, Alfred	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	0·33	...	1	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	6 18	2 6	0 26
Jenkins and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	0 35	0 35	0 1
Lloyd Autrichien	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	12 40	6 20	0 13
MacGregor, Gow, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Messageries Maritimes	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	1·67	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	18 44	3 45	0 11
Nederland (Stoomvaart Maatschappij)	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	10	10	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	72 37	7 16	1 6
Norddeutscher Lloyd	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	14 50	7 25	0 17
Orient Line	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2 10	2 10	0 2
Cie. Péninsulaire et Orientale	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	0·71	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	9 11	1 50	0 3
Rankin, Gilmour	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rhederei (Deutsche Dampfschiffe)	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	4	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	5 41	1 25	0 6
R. Sapner and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rotterdam Lloyd	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Samuel, Marcus	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Smith and Sons, G.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Th. Wilson, Sons, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Wood, J. M.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Totaux et Moyennes	...	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	86	1·72	3	3	6	4	2	...	1	1	3	...	...	...	2	...	...	29	349 31	4 4	—
2. Armateurs dont les navires n'ont pas effectué un minimum de 24 traversées. Ensemble 239 armateurs	2	...	2	...	1	2	1	1	188	2·24	15	9	4	2	3	3	1	1	...	...	3	1	3	2	3	48	1,422 1	7 34	—
Total	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	274	2·04	18	12	10	6	5	3	2	2	3	...	3	1	5	2	3	77	1,771 32	6 29	—

Paris, le 24 Avril, 1894.

No. 36.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received June 19.)

(No. 19. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, June 12, 1894.*

WITH reference to our despatch No. 16 of the 5th instant, we have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith the exact figures, as published in the official journal of the Suez Canal Company, of the various votes taken at the general meeting held on the 5th instant, on the Resolutions submitted to the shareholders for their approval by the Council of Administration.*

We have, &c.

(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 37.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, June 21, 1894.*

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, to be laid before the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, the accompanying copy of a despatch from the British Directors of the Suez Canal Company respecting the general meeting of the shareholders held on the 5th instant.†

I am, &c.

(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

No. 38.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, June 28, 1894.*

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, to be laid before the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, the accompanying copy of a despatch from the British Directors of the Suez Canal Company respecting pensions to be granted to the family of M. Ferdinand de Lesseps.‡

I am, &c.

(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

No. 39.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received July 2.)

(No. 20. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, June 29, 1894.*

WITH reference to our despatch No. 16 of the 5th instant, we have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copies of the stenographic Report of the proceedings of the general assembly of the shareholders of the Suez Canal,* which took place on the 5th instant.

We have, &c.

(For the British Suez Canal Directors),

(Signed) H. AUSTIN LEE.

---

* Not printed. † No. 36. ‡ No. 34.

No. 40.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—Received July 7.)

(No. 21. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, July 4, 1894.*

WITH reference to our despatch No. 17, Commercial, of the 10th ultimo, we have the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship a copy of the decision approved by the Council of the Suez Canal Company at their meeting yesterday with regard to the payments to be made out of the salaries of the Administrators in connection with the allowances voted to M. Ferdinand de Lesseps and his sons, and the expenses of the deed assigning a pension to M. de Lesseps' family.

In the above-mentioned despatch we informed your Lordship that the Council had agreed to pay out of their fees the allowances up to the end of the half-year ending the 30th June, but, on examination of the Resolution adopted by the shareholders, the Council considered that they were authorized to pay the pension granted to M. de Lesseps' family from the beginning of the year instead of from the 1st July—the date specified in our despatch.

The contribution for which the Council have therefore made themselves responsible will be reduced from 245,000 fr. to 185,000 fr., and it has been agreed that this amount shall be paid in three instalments, the first in July 1894, amounting to 64,000 fr., payable out of the balance of the share of the 2 per cent. on the net profits of the Company for the year 1893, and the two remaining instalments of 64,000 fr. and 57,000 fr. in January and July 1895 respectively, out of the share of the profits accruing to the members of the Council in 1894.

We have, &c.

(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure in No. 40.

Amended Decision with regard to Payments of Pension to the Lesseps Family.

IL est rappelé que dans la séance du 4 Juin il a été proposé au Conseil d'Administration de retenir, sur la répartition du solde des 2 pour cent revenant aux Administrateurs pour 1893 et sur les répartitions à faire en Janvier et Juillet 1895, les sommes avancées à Mme. Ferdinand de Lesseps du 1er Octobre au 31 Décembre, 1893, et à MM. Charles A. de Lesseps et Victor de Lesseps du 1er Janvier au 30 Juin, 1894, ainsi que les frais de l'acte notarié constituant la pension de la famille de M. Ferdinand de Lesseps.

Deux propositions avaient été présentées pour la mise à exécution de cette retenue :

Ou retenir à chaque Administrateur une somme proportionnelle à la totalité de ce qu'il aura touché à un titre quelconque;

Ou faire porter la retenue seulement sur les jetons de présence du Conseil.

La première proposition avait été écartée comme portant atteinte à des rétributions fixes allouées pour un travail bien déterminé.

La seconde proposition avait été adoptée par le Conseil.

Le Comité a à interpréter cette décision en ce qui concerne les 10 pour cent qui lui sont attribués sur tout ce qui, dans les 2 pour cent du Conseil, dépasse 200,000 fr. Il paraît équitable de distinguer dans cette allocation supplémentaire ce qui est attribué comme rémunération d'un travail spécial et ce qui est alloué comme supplément d'indemnité, comme une sorte de jetons aux membres du Comité. Ces jetons seuls doivent participer à la retenue comme les jetons du Conseil.

La proposition de pensions à la famille de Lesseps, votée par l'Assemblée, portant que les pensions seront "prélevées annuellement sur les produits de chaque exercice," l'effet de cette résolution remonte au 1er Janvier, 1894; et les Administrateurs seront remboursés de la somme qu'ils auront avancée de ce chef.

Le Comité adopte cette nouvelle proposition, qui sera soumise au Conseil dans sa prochaine séance.

Approuvé par MM. les Administrateurs à la suite de la séance du Conseil d'Administration du 3 Juillet, 1894.

No. 41.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir, *Foreign Office, July* 10, 1894.

WITH reference to Foreign Office letter of the 28th ultimo, I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, to be laid before the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, the accompanying copy of a despatch from the British Directors of the Suez Canal Company respecting the allowances voted to M. Ferdinand de Lesseps and his sons.*

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GREY.

No. 42.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received July 18.)

(No. 100.)
My Lord, *Cairo, July* 6, 1894.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a letter from certain prominent residents in Port Saïd to Mr. Consul Gould, inclosing a Petition addressed by upwards of a thousand European inhabitants of that town and many natives to the Governor-General of the isthmus with reference to their water supply.

Your Lordship will observe that not only do the petitioners complain of the bad quality of the water supplied by the Suez Canal Company, and of the very exorbitant charge which is made for it, but they point out that the Company have also failed to carry out the terms of their agreement and provide water gratuitously from a pipe carried through the centre of the town.

The action of the Company in this matter is being severely criticised, and the inhabitants of Port Saïd appear to have a legitimate grievance. There are so many British subjects among their number, and British interests at Port Saïd are so important that I venture to recommend the object of this Petition to your Lordship's favourable consideration, in the hope that it may be possible to secure for their representation the support of the British Directors at head-quarters.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RENNELL RODD.

Inclosure in No. 42.

Mr. Royle, and others, to Consul Gould.

M. le Consul, *Port-Saïd, le* 30 *Juin*, 1894.

LES Soussignés ont l'honneur de porter à votre connaissance qu'une Pétition concernant diverses questions relatives à l'eau fournie à la ville de Port-Saïd par la Compagnie du Canal a été adressée le 28 Juin à son Excellence Maher Pacha, Gouverneur-Général de l'Isthme.

De cette Pétition, qui portait plus de mille signatures d'Européens de toutes les nationalités et de nombreuses signatures d'indigènes, les Soussignés se font un devoir de vous remettre ci-inclus une copie avec prière de vouloir bien vous intéresser à leurs justes réclamations et faire toutes les démarches que vous croirez opportunes en vue d'une solution favorable à leurs demandes.

Confiants dans l'intérêt que vous avez toujours montré pour tout ce qui touche aux besoins de la population Port-Saïdienne, les Soussignés sont fermement convaincus que cette fois non plus votre appui ne leur fera pas défaut, et dans cet espoir ils vous prient, M. le Consul, &c.

(Signé) GEORGE ROYLE (and others).

---

* No. 40.

No. 43.

Foreign Office to British Suez Canal Directors.

(No. 7. Commercial.)
Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, July* 25, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Kimberley to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch from the Acting British Agent and Consul-General in Egypt,* calling attention to complaints which have been addressed by the European inhabitants of Port Saïd to Her Majesty's Consul in that town on the subject of their water supply.

I am to request that this matter may be taken into consideration, with a view to the adoption of such measures as may be necessary to put an end to the grievances complained of, if they should prove to be well founded.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 44.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received August 8.)

(No. 22. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Paris, August* 7, 1894.

IN reply to your despatch No. 7, Commercial, of the 25th ultimo, we have the honour to inform your Lordship that the question of the water supply at Port Saïd has been for some time past under the consideration of the Suez Canal Board with a view to its improvement and a reduction in cost.

We have again called attention to the subject, and we trust that before long steps will be taken in the sense desired by the European inhabitants of Port Saïd.

We will not fail to keep your Lordship fully informed upon the subject.

We may add that the Company do not appear yet to have received the Memorial addressed to the Governor of the Canal, of which a copy was inclosed in Mr. Rodd's despatch No. 100 of the 6th July.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 45.

The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. Rodd.

(No. 26. Commercial.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, August* 11, 1894.

YOUR despatch No. 100 of the 6th ultimo, recommending a Petition urging the improvement of the water supply at Port Saïd, was duly communicated to the British Directors of the Canal, and I now inclose copy of their reply on the subject for the information of the petitioners.

I am, &c.
(Signed) KIMBERLEY.

---

* No. 42.

No. 46.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received September 18.)

(No. 112.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, September* 18, 1894.

I HAVE the honour to report that the European workmen whom the Suez Canal Company employ on their dredgers have struck, and that their strike is assuming threatening proportions. It is feared that the workmen will destroy the dredgers.

The Commandant of Police, accompanied by European constables, has left for Port Saïd.

No. 47.

The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. Austin Lee.

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, September* 24, 1894.

INVITE Suez Canal Company to show conciliatory attitude towards the workmen in the matter of the strike at Port Saïd. Their case is rather hard according to Mr. Rodd. He telegraphs that, if a little conciliation is shown, there are hopes of a settlement.

No. 48.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received September 27.)

(No. 119.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, September* 27, 1894.

WITH reference to my telegram to your Lordship, No. 116, I have the honour to report that I am informed that the demands of the strikers have been refused by the Suez Canal Board, but that this Board will offer to re-employ the men. If the latter refuse, the Company will remove their dredgers, and then there is a possibility of disturbances. M. Gryparis, the Greek Consul-General, has been unable to influence the strikers in any way.

I venture to suggest to your Lordship that it would be desirable to put pressure on the Committee at Paris.

I have repeated the above to Mr. Phipps.

No. 49.

Mr. Phipps to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received September 27.)

(No. 2. Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Paris, September* 27, 1894.

I WILL act at once in the matter of the Suez Canal strike on Mr. Rodd's No. 119 repeated to me; I already acted on behalf of Mr. Lee on your Lordship's telegram of the 24th instant.

No. 50.

Mr. Phipps to Foreign Office.—(Received September 28.)

My dear Bergne, *Paris, September* 27, 1894.

WITH reference to my telegram of to-day, I inclose copy of a Memorandum made by Clarke, who I sent to the Suez Canal Company this afternoon, together with the copy of the telegram sent by the Company to Cairo.

No. 50*.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received September 28.)

Sir, *Admiralty, September* 27, 1894.

I AM commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th August,* inclosing a Return, drawn up by the Suez Canal Company, showing the groundings in the Suez Canal in the year 1893; and I am to request that you will move the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to cause my Lords to be furnished with the Returns for the years 1891 and 1892, which do not appear to have reached the Admiralty.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

* Sending copy of No. 35.

I will inform Rodd by telegraph that Suez Canal Company has sent to its Agent at Cairo its views.

Yours ever,
(Signed) E. C. H. PHIPPS.

P.S.—I don't like to interfere as intermediary.

E. C. H. P.

Inclosure 1 in No. 50.

Memorandum by Mr. Clarke.

I SAW Rouville who tells me the whole affair is grossly exaggerated, there being only eighty men on strike.

Lee has personally been advising the Company not to make any concessions. Rouville gave me the annexed copy of a telegram sent to-day to Suez Canal Agent at Cairo.

There is to be a meeting of Company to-morrow in London at which Rouville thinks Lee is sure to be present.

(Signed) F. S. CLARKE.

September 27, 1894.

Inclosure 2 in No. 50.

Telegram sent to Agent of Suez Canal Company at Cairo, September 27, 1894.

LE Comité est parfaitement résolu à ne pas faire les concessions qui lui sont demandées et qui porteraient grave atteinte aux droits absolus de la Compagnie. Si le Gouvernement Égyptien se déclare impuissant à garantir sécurité pour les travaux de la Compagnie, le Comité demandera Lundi au Conseil de surseoir jusqu'à nouvel ordre à la mise en activité des dragues en laissant au Gouvernement la responsabilité des conséquences qui pourraient en résulter.

No. 51.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received September 28.)

(No. 116.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, September* 28, 1894.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 112 on the subject of the strike at Port Saïd, I should be grateful if your Lordship would urge on the Suez Canal Company, through the English Directors, the expediency of acting towards their workmen in a conciliatory spirit. Their case is a hard one, but if the Company are conciliatory, there is a hope that some settlement may be arrived at.

No. 52.

The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. Rodd.

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, September* 28, 1894.

PORT SAÏD strike.

Meetings have been held by the English Commercial Committee and by the French Committee, and notwithstanding the recommendation of the President of the Council to

which full weight has been given, both have decided that no concession can be made to the strikers. They consider that their property is entitled to police protection if disorders follow. Do you think that the police would be sufficiently strong for that purpose?

Please reply by return, as on Monday a full meeting of Directors is held.

No. 53.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received September 29.)

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, September* 29, 1894.

WITH reference to the telegram from your Lordship of yesterday's date, I have the honour to report that the property of the Company should be adequately protected by the special police force recently dispatched to Port Saïd.

No. 54.

Memorandum communicated by Mr. Austin Lee, September 29, 1894.

JE vous transmets, pour la communiquer au Comité Consultatif, dans sa réunion du 28 courant, une note sur la grève des dragueurs de Port-Saïd.

Grève des Dragueurs de Port-Saïd.

La dépêche suivante est parvenue ce matin à l'Administration Centrale, pendant la séance du Comité de Direction :—

"*Port-Saïd, le* 27 *Septembre*, 1894, 10*h.* 15*m.*

"Consul-Général de Grèce et Fenwick ici, continuant trouver situation grave et le second insistant sur extrême désir Président du Conseil éviter incident violent, prier instamment accorder pardon général. Dans le cas où Comité accorderait Gouverneur-Général engagerait ouvriers reprendre travail. Si eux pas consentir police agirait en cas trouble. Dans ces conditions Gouvernement et Compagnie pourraient dire avoir été jusqu'à extrême limite patience indulgence. Cette formule quoique différente instruction impliquerait aucune concession. Croire devoir soumettre.—SÉRIONNE."

Le Comité de Direction a fait expédier en réponse à l'Agent Supérieur le télégramme dont la teneur suit :—

"*Paris, le* 27 *Septembre*, 1894.

"Le Comité est parfaitement résolu à ne pas faire les concessions qui lui sont demandées et qui porteraient une grave atteinte aux droits absolus de la Compagnie. Si le Gouvernement Égyptien se déclare impuissant à garantir sécurité pour travaux Compagnie, le Comité demandera Lundi au Conseil de surseoir jusqu'à nouvel ordre à la mise en activité des dragues en laissant Gouvernement Égyptien toute la responsabilité de toutes les conséquences qui pourraient en résulter.—GUICHARD."

Le Comité de Direction a été unanimement d'avis que consentir les concessions demandées par le Consul-Général de Grèce et le Chef de la Police Égyptienne serait de la part de la Compagnie l'abdication complète de ses droits et que cela lui enlèverait pour l'avenir toute autorité sur ses ouvriers.

Dans sa séance du 3 Septembre courant, le Conseil d'Administration a été informé des incidents, jugés alors sans importance, qui avaient pris naissance dans une petite fraction des ouvriers de la Compagnie à Port-Saïd.

Il a reçu communication des télégrammes et correspondance échangés à cette date entre la Direction et l'Égypte et dont la teneur peut se résumer ainsi :—

Le 20 Août dernier, une soixantaine d'ouvriers (matelots et chauffeurs), ne faisant pas partie du cadre et appartenant aux équipages des dragues marines et de leurs porteurs de la section de Port-Saïd, profitaient de l'arrêt périodique de ces appareils pour le lavage des chaudières et abandonnaient leur poste. Ils déclaraient qu'ils ne le reprendraient que si la Compagnie s'engageait par écrit à leur assurer dix mois de travail par an comme aux ouvriers des autres sections; sinon ils réclamaient une indemnité de licenciement et une allocation de rapatriement. Il ne pouvait être donné suite à une semblable mise en demeure d'autant que les dragues marines à Port-Saïd ne peuvent pas fonctionner pendant les quatre mois d'hiver. Au point de vue des salaires le résultat est à peu près le même, car, pendant ces quatre mois, les équipages font un nombre d'heures supplémentaires qui arrivent à représenter un gain presque équivalent à la plus longue durée des services d'équipes dans les autres sections.

Par menaces ou entraînement, le nombre total des ouvriers ayant abandonné le travail n'a pas dépassé 100. Les tentatives faites pour détourner les ouvriers sur la ligne du Canal ont totalement échoué.

Le Comité de Direction avait télégraphié à l'Ingénieu-en-chef de la Compagnie en Égypte et à l'Agent Supérieur par intérim qu'aucun des ouvriers qui avaient quitté leur poste ne serait admis dans la suite à rentrer en fonctions.

Dans l'intervalle, le Gouverneur-Général du Canal, après avoir reçu le 29 Août la visite des délégués des grévistes qui lui remettaient une Pétition, et dans les entrevues qu'il avait eues avec l'Ingénieur-en-chef de la Compagnie et l'Agent Supérieur par intérim, s'efforçait de ramener les ouvriers dissidents et demandait à la Compagnie, en vue d'éviter des complications possibles, de ne pas user de rigueur et de reprendre tous les grévistes s'ils se soumettaient.

A ce moment, M. l'Agent Supérieur, abrégeant son congé à Paris, rentrait en Égypte et dès son arrivée à Alexandrie, le 30 Août, obtenait une audience du Président du Conseil, à qui il exposait la situation et la nécessité pour le Gouverneur du Canal de ne point paraître encourager les prétentions des ouvriers et de borner son intervention aux mesures nécessaires pour maintenir l'ordre public.

Des instructions dans ce sens furent envoyées par le Président du Conseil Égyptien au Gouverneur du Canal et lorsque M. de Sérionne se rendit à Port-Saïd, constata que l'agitation ouvrière était en décroissance. Des ouvriers Italiens, quelques Français, et un Belge, qui avaient suivi le mouvement, la plupart sous l'intimidation et les menaces des Grecs, fauteurs de la grève, s'étaient séparés de ceux-ci et demandaient à reprendre leur service, exposant qu'ils l'avaient quitté contraints et forcés et qu'ils ne maintenaient nullement leur réclamation. Quant aux Grecs, quoique M. de Sérionne les eût accueillis et leur eut démontré l'inanité de leurs réclamations, ils persistèrent dans leur résolution.

Tels sont les faits dont le Conseil a été saisi dans sa dernière séance et qui dénotaient une situation sans gravité, vu le nombre insignifiant des grévistes et le manque de fondement de leurs prétentions.

Un courrier arrivé postérieurement à la séance du Conseil a apporté le texte de la Pétition que les ouvriers en grève avaient remise le 29 Août à Maher Pacha pour solliciter son intervention auprès de la Compagnie. Dans ce document, les signataires exposent leurs griefs dans les termes qui contrastent avec la bienveillance qui leur a toujours été témoignée. Ils disent, par exemple :—

"Quant aux nouveaux Règlements de la Compagnie ou aux nouvelles Circulaires que la Compagnie fait circuler de part et d'autre, nous les ignorons complètement : la Compagnie jusqu'à ce jour ne nous avait prévenus de rien ; ce n'est qu'au Gouvernorat que nous avons pris connaissance de ces Règlements et nous avons pu constater de près que nous sommes véritablement le jouet de la Compagnie, puisque d'un moment à l'autre elle change ses Règlements et comme cela lui plaît, sans qu'aucune raison ne régit sa conduite . . . . ."

Et plus loin :—

"Pour vous prouver l'injuste conduite de la Compagnie envers nous, nous vous la démontrerons par ce qui s'ensuivra. La Compagnie prétend que quoique nous travaillions dans l'année six ou sept mois, avec les heures supplémentaires ça nous revient à dix mois, et que par conséquent nous n'avons pas lieu de réclamer. Soit, nous acceptons ce beau raisonnement de la Compagnie et nous sommes parfaitement d'accord avec elle sur ce sujet ; mais nous attirons votre attention, Excellence, que si la Compagnie nous compte

les heures supplémentaires pour se justifier envers notre demande de dix mois de travail, elle doit également en toute équité les compter pour toute autre action; or, il s'ensuit qu'en Octobre 1891, la Compagnie fit une Circulaire et disait: quiconque aurait huit ans pleins de service serait regardé comme ouvrier fixe de la Compagnie. Tous les ouvriers qui sont en grève aujourd'hui ne sont pas regardés comme ouvriers fixes de la Compagnie parce qu'ils n'ont pas pleins les huit ans de service. Si cependant la Compagnie aurait pris en considération les heures supplémentaires comme elle les prend aujourd'hui pour les dix mois de travail, nous aurions été regardés tous comme ouvriers fixes de la Compagnie, et au lieu de dix mois de travail que nous réclamons nous aurions douze mois, et nous sommes très heureux que la Compagnie nous fournit une occasion de nous faire tous ouvriers—fixes—à moins que la Compagnie ne voudra rétracter sa parole, comme elle a l'habitude de la faire; mais nous en appelons à vous, Excellence. Vous voyez donc, Excellence, que la Compagnie ne se conduit pas en homme loyal. Là où ça lui plaît elle compte les heures, là où ça ne lui plaît pas, elle ne compte pas les heures; la Compagnie possède donc deux faces. La loi humaine crierait contre une telle injustice."

L'Agent Supérieur de la Compagnie, en accusant réception de ce document à Maher Pacha, en a péremptoirement réfuté les allégations inexactes dans la lettre suivante:—

"Excellence, "*Port-Saïd, le 2 Septembre*, 1894.

"J'ai l'honneur de vous accuser réception de votre lettre No. 241 ainsi que de la Pétition qui y était jointe, à vous adressée par un certain nombre d'ouvriers de la Compagnie qui ont abandonné leur travail depuis le 20 Août dernier.

"Je ne puis que vous confirmer ce que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous exposer hier au cours de ma visite touchant l'obligation où je me trouve de m'en tenir à l'application des Règlements de notre Compagnie.

"Comme les diverses réclamations inscrites dans la Pétition que vous me communiquez se rattachent presque toutes à des points qui ont déjà au cours des années précédentes, motivé des incidents qui ont été réglés avec le Gouvernorat-Général de Port-Saïd, je crois intéressant de vous rappeler mes explications sur chacune de ces réclamations:—

"1. Les ouvriers qui ont abandonné leur travail demandent que la Compagnie s'engage à leur assurer dix mois de travail par an.

"J'ai eu l'occasion de répondre l'année dernière à une demande semblable qui m'était adressée par des ouvriers des ateliers généraux. J'ai absolument refusé de faire droit à cette prétention expliquant que la Compagnie ne pouvait, pas plus que tout patron employant des ouvriers, faire exécuter plus de travaux que ceux dont elle avait le soin. Il y a donc erreur absolue lorsque les signataires de la Pétition affirment que la Compagnie s'est engagée à faire travailler pendant dix mois les ouvriers de ses ateliers généraux.

"2. Demande d'une indemnité analogue à celle accordée en 1892 aux ouvriers licenciés. Aucune comparaison ne saurait être établie entre la situation des ouvriers licenciés en 1892 et celle des ouvriers qui ont quitté leur travail le 20 Août.

"Vous retrouverez dans les archives de votre Gouvernorat-Général la correspondance qui a été échangée en 1893 entre son Excellence le Gouverneur-Général et l'Agent Supérieur de la Compagnie, vous y verrez—son Excellence Adly Bey présent à cette époque à Port-Saïd vous le confirmera—qu'il s'agissait d'un certain nombre d'ouvriers qui avaient été précédemment mis à pied sans qu'on leur eût signifié leur licenciement définitif, et qui avaient pu croire qu'ils retrouveraient du travail sur les chantiers de la Compagnie. La Compagnie eut pu, en droit strict, ne rien donner à ces ouvriers; elle jugea cependant qu'il était conforme à ses traditions de bienveillance de leur tenir compte de ce qu'ils n'avaient plus à attendre de travail et de ce que la saison à laquelle ce licenciement leur était notifié était peu propice pour trouver du travail en Europe. Elle leur accorda une indemnité de licenciement et des frais de rapatriement. Aujourd'hui, rien de pareil; les ouvriers qui réclament ne sont pas licenciés, ils ont volontairement quitté leur travail. Si nous n'avions plus eu de travail à leur donner, ils en eussent été avisés deux mois avant la cessation du travail; je ne crois pas qu'aucun patron accorde un si grand délai à ses ouvriers pour chercher une autre occupation, mais je le répète, les signataires de la Pétition ne sont pas des ouvriers licenciés.

"3. Application des nouveaux Règlements. Il est absolument inexact que les signataires de la Pétition n'aient pas eu connaissance de ce qu'ils appellent les nouveaux Règlements de la Compagnie. Lorsque, à la suite des incidents de 1893, que je rappelais plus haut, la Compagnie jugea utile de réglementer le licenciement des ouvriers qui jusqu'alors ne l'était pas, ce qui revient à dire que la Compagnie avait le droit strict, comme tout patron, de renvoyer sans avis préalable et sans indemnité les ouvriers dont elle n'avait plus besoin, la décision de la Direction fut affichée sur tous les chantiers et à bord de tous les appareils de la Compagnie.

"4 et 5. Ces deux paragraphes ont trait à la non-inscription des pétitionnaires au

cadre des ouvriers. Vous savez, Excellence, que la Compagnie a, en effet, institué un cadre dans lequel sont inscrits certains de ses anciens ouvriers payés désormais au mois; mais pour être inscrit au cadre, il est une considération énoncée dans la lettre du 6 Octobre, 1891, à laquelle font allusion les pétitionnaires, c'est que les ouvriers aient huit années de service sans interruption de travail supérieure à quatre mois sauf les cas de maladie constatée; or, aucun des pétitionnaires ne remplit cette condition.

"En présence de l'attitude prise par les ouvriers qui ont purement et simplement abandonné leur poste, j'aurais pu me refuser à tout examen de réclamations qui ne m'ont, d'ailleurs, pas été adressées. J'ai tenu cependant à entrer dans le détail des divers points de la Pétition qui vous a été remise, pour vous prouver l'inanité des motifs dont on s'est servi pour amener nos ouvriers à abandonner un travail que la Compagnie s'est toujours attachée à leur assurer aussi durable et aussi productif que possible.

"Veuillez agréer, &c.

"L'Agent Supérieur,

(Signé) "DE SÉRIONNE."

A la suite de la démarche des grévistes et de la réponse de M. de Sérionne au Gouverneur-Général, le Comité, dans sa séance du 13 Septembre, a décidé de considérer comme définitif le départ des ouvriers qui avait quitté le travail, sauf les exceptions que l'Agent Supérieur justifierait. Le Comité a prescrit en même temps la reprise des travaux à Port-Saïd, en empruntant au besoin du personnel aux équipes du Canal, et le réarmement immédiat d'au moins une des dragues marines.

Le 18 Septembre l'Agent Supérieur a signalé de Port-Saïd que la veille au soir on avait dû faire appel à la police pour empêcher les grévistes d'envahir les dragues où ils avaient continué à venir coucher, depuis leur abandon du travail. La suppression de cette tolérance qui ne pouvait se prolonger, avait déterminé une certaine surexcitation; aussi le Gouverneur demande-t-il qu'on attendit l'arrivée de renforts de police, avant de remettre en marche une drague. Il y fut consenti.

Fenwick Pacha, Général Commandant la Police en Égypte, est arrivé à Port-Saïd le 19 Septembre avec cinquante hommes de renfort. Il a eu une entrevue avec l'Agent Supérieur de la Compagnie, auquel il a déclaré qu'il considérait la situation comme très grave, et qu'il désirait aller prendre des instructions formelles du Président du Conseil sur la limite dans laquelle il devrait intervenir. L'Agent Supérieur a accédé à cette demande, et a fixé la date du 21 Septembre pour la mise en marche de la première drague.

Le Comité, dans sa séance du 20 Septembre, a admis la réintégration des dix-huit ouvriers qui n'avaient quitté le travail que sous la menace de leurs camarades; il a fait plus: il a autorisé l'Agent Supérieur à agir pour le mieux, mais en fixant les non-reprises à la moitié au moins du nombre de ceux qui avaient abandonné leur poste. Par la même dépêche il indiquait à M. de Sérionne qu'il ne pouvait comprendre comment la non-reprise d'un si petit nombre de grévistes pouvait déterminer une situation très grave et lui demandait des explications sur ce point.

Le lendemain l'Agent Supérieur a télégraphié que les autorités Égyptiennes voudraient éviter un conflit que la police croyait devoir se produire, et qui pourrait donner à supposer en Europe que la sécurité du Canal serait menacée. Elles pensent que des troubles dans la population Grecque sur laquelle l'autorité du Consul est nulle pourraient créer des embarras. L'Agent Supérieur est prêt à exécuter les ordres de la Direction, mais il craint de ne pas trouver tout l'appui nécessaire auprès du Ministre Égyptien.

La drague marine, qui devait recommencer à marcher le 22 Septembre, n'est pas sortie à cette date. Fenwick Pacha ayant prié par télégramme qu'il fut sursis à cette reprise des opérations jusqu'à son retour à Port-Saïd, après l'entretien qu'il devait avoir avec Nubar Pacha.

Le 24 Septembre la Direction a été télégraphiquement informée que, par lettre personnelle, le Président du Conseil avait demandé à l'Agent Supérieur d'attendre, avant de faire marcher la drague, l'arrivée à Port-Saïd du Consul-Général de Grèce, qui était disposé à appuyer de sa présence les mesures nécessaires. L'Agent Supérieur a répondu à Nubar Pacha qu'il accédait à son désir, mais que le travail devrait être repris dans le courant de cette semaine sans faute.

Voici, d'ailleurs, la note qui a paru, au sujet de cette grève, dans le "Bulletin Décadaire" du 22 Septembre:—

"Les journaux ont publié des télégrammes de Port-Saïd conçus de façon à faire croire qu'un mouvement d'une certaine importance s'était produit dans cette ville, et pouvait inspirer des inquiétudes quant à la sécurité du transit et du matériel de la Compagnie.

"Ces dépêches sont inexactes. L'agitation qui s'est manifestée dans le personnel des dragues marines de Port-Saïd et de leurs porteurs a été toute partielle et sans écho dans les autres chantiers du Canal, qui comptent 2,000 ouvriers. Voici les faits dont l'Administration est saisie :—

"Le 21 Août dernier, l'Ingénieur-en-chef de la Compagnie en Égypte télégraphiait que 100 des ouvriers appartenant aux équipages de trois dragues marines et de neuf bateaux porteurs de Port-Saïd avaient, à l'occasion de l'arrêt ordinaire de trois jours pour le lavage des chaudières, abandonné leur poste, et déclaré qu'ils ne le reprendraient que si la Compagnie s'engageait par écrit à leur assurer dix mois de travail l'année prochaine, à défaut de quoi ils resteraient en grève. Leur demande ne pouvant être accueillie parce que les travaux à la mer doivent être interrompus chaque année pendant l'hiver, ces équipes persistèrent à ne pas reprendre leur travail.

"Des télégrammes réguliers ont tenu la Direction au courant de la situation. Ils signalaient que les tentatives des grévistes en vue de détourner de leur devoir les autres ouvriers sur la ligne du Canal avaient complètement échoué, et que le Gouverneur avait pris les mesures nécessaires pour maintenir l'ordre public.

"Dès la réception des premières nouvelles de cet incident, l'Agent Supérieur de la Compagnie, alors en congé à Paris, a regagné l'Égypte et s'est rendu aussitôt à Port-Saïd.

"A son arrivée, le 1er Septembre, M. de Sérionne a pu constater que sur les 100 ouvriers, la plupart Grecs, Dalmates, et Italiens, qui avaient abandonné volontairement leur poste, un certain nombre demandaient à les reprendre sans conditions, en déclarant qu'ils n'avaient fait que céder aux menaces de leurs camarades.

"Le Comité de Direction a télégraphié à l'Agent Supérieur qu'il approuvait la réintégration de ces ouvriers entraînés malgré eux, mais qu'il ne saurait consentir à reprendre aucun de ceux qui, après avoir quitté volontairement leur service, ont attenté à la liberté du travail."

Paris, le 25 *Septembre*, 1894.

No. 55.

Sir P. Anderson to Mr. Austin Lee.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, September* 30, 1894.

MY language meets with Lord Kimberley's entire approval. His Lordship says that the Board may be informed of Mr. Rodd's answer about the police, and that they must form their own opinion as to how far his advice should be followed.

No. 56.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 1.)

(No. 141.)

My Lord, *Cairo, September* 20, 1894.

I HAVE the honour to report that a strike broke out a short while ago among the European workmen employed in manning three dredgers of the Suez Canal Company at Port Saïd.

The men on strike, some 105 in number, are mostly Greeks, but there is one British subject among them who is, I am informed, only an unwilling sympathizer.

The strikers are not among the permanent employés of the Company, which only requires their services for a limited period each year.

The men ask for the conditions which were accorded to similar day labourers a year or two back. They ask for a guarantee of ten months' employment in the year, or in case of discharge, for fifteen days' pay or the cost of their repatriation, and also for the dismissal of an overseer who is extremely unpopular. They maintain that the cost of living is so great at Port Saïd that they cannot support themselves and their families unless ten months' employment is guaranteed, nor have they the means of going elsewhere. The Company's representatives, on the other hand, maintain that the men have already been working for four months this year, and that they were told that there was work in prospect for them until the end of the year, and that they cannot bind themselves by any conditions as to the future.

It appears that no inconvenience will be caused by the stoppage of the work of dredging the seaward channel for the next six months.

The present position is, however, that the Company's representative has announced his intention of sending the dredgers out without the strikers, who have, consequently, resorted to menace.

I need not remind your Lordship of what serious consequences would ensue if by any act of violence on the part of the strikers one of the dredgers were to be sunk in the channel.

The Acting Inspector-General of Police has left for Port Saïd with an adequate force of European constables to keep order.

He has informed me that he has for the moment induced the Company's representatives not to send the dredgers out, in the hope of finding a solution, but that it appears that stringent orders have been sent from Paris not to give way on any point, and he has only been able to succeed in inducing them to telegraph to Paris for permission to take back a certain proportion of the men if they submit unconditionally.

The force at Port Saïd is quite sufficient to prevent any breach of public order, but they cannot remain there indefinitely; and it is much to be hoped that, as the workmen are now showing a disposition to moderate their views, the Company will also be prepared to make some slight concessions or agree to a form of arbitration.

The expenditure of the Company in other directions has, rightly or wrongly, been made so much a matter of public comment here that they will not have much sympathy in pressing hardly on a small number of workingmen whose life, under the present conditions of their employment, is certainly one of struggle.

I have, &c.

(Signed) RENNELL RODD.

No. 57.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 1.)

(Commercial.)

(Telegraphic.) *Cairo, September* 30, 1894, 8·20 P.M.

CONSUL at Port Saïd reports strikers quiet, but Chief Engineer of Company was wounded last night at Ismaïlia by unknown individual.

No. 58.

Mr. Austin Lee to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 1.)

(Telegraphic.) *Paris, October* 1, 1894.

THE Suez Canal Company's Chief Engineer has been assassinated at Ismaïlia.

No. 59.

Foreign Office to Mr. Austin Lee.

My dear Lee, *Foreign Office, October* 1, 1894.

WE hear from Rodd that he has a report from the Consul at Port Saïd to the effect that the strikers are quiet, but that an unknown individual wounded the Company's Chief Engineer at Ismaïlia on the night of the 29th. No doubt the Directors have received the same information.

Yours truly,

(Signed) H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 60.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 1.)

(Telegraphic.) P. *Paris, October* 1, 1894.

WITH reference to Sir P. Anderson's Confidential telegram of yesterday, respecting Suez Canal strike, we have thought it advisable not to avail ourselves of your Lordship's permission to communicate to the Council the substance of Mr. Rodd's telegram of the 29th ultimo, in view of the assassination of Company's Chief Engineer and the strong feelings expressed by our French colleagues that sufficient energy had not been shown by the Egyptian Government. At this afternoon's meeting the Council determined to send Directors M. Patinot and Prince d'Arenberg to Egypt immediately.

No. 61.

The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. Rodd.

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, October* 2, 1894, 1·40 P.M.

WE hear that at yesterday's Suez Canal meeting French Directors, in view of assassination of Engineer, expressed strong opinion that Egyptian Government had not shown sufficient energy in the matter of the strike. We understand that two Directors will go at once to Egypt.

No. 62.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 3.)

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, October* 3, 1894.

I LEARN, by a telegram just received from Mr. Maling, at Port Saïd, that the crews of three more dredgers near Ismaïlia have gone to the former place to take part in the strike. The class of men now out on strike is one with which it is very difficult to deal, and it is to be feared that individual acts of violence may take place if the Company maintains its uncompromising attitude and if coercive measures are adopted, although the force now available is quite sufficient to prevent anything in the nature of an organized movement.

Mr. Maling has some fear that the French ship of war "Troude" will seize upon any disturbance which may perhaps occur for landing sailors, on the ground of the necessity of affording protection to French residents.

Her Majesty's Agent and Consul-General arrives at Port Saïd this evening.

No. 63.

Foreign Office to Sir J. Stokes.

Dear Sir John, *Foreign Office, October* 3, 1894.

SINCE I saw you we have received a telegram from Cairo saying that it is reported from Port Saïd that the strikers have been joined by the crews of three more dredgers from up the Canal.

It is said that the available force is ample to prevent an organized movement, but that, if the strike continues, and coercive measures are taken, individual acts of violence are to be feared.

Yours truly,
(Signed) H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 60*.

Foreign Office to British Suez Canal Directors.

(No. 8. Commercial.)
Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, October* 1, 1894.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 18, Commercial, of the 11th June, transmitting a Return showing the groundings in the Suez Canal during the year 1893, I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to inform you that the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty would be glad to be supplied, if possible, with the corresponding Returns for the years 1891 and 1892.

I am, &c.
(Signed) H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 64.

*The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.**—(*Received October* 4.)

(No. 23. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Paris, October* 1, 1894.

WE have the honour to report to your Lordship that difficulties arose in the month of August between the Suez Canal Company and the workmen employed on the marine dredger and the hopper barges attached to it, which are engaged in dredging the entrance to Port Saïd outside of the piers.

These workmen refused to continue working unless the Company would insure to them ten months' work in the year. As it is not possible for the dredger to work in the open sea for more than eight months of the year, the Company could not comply with this demand, and required the men to resume work. When the Conseil met last month it was supposed that the affair was settléd, and we therefore did not think it necessary to trouble your Lordship with a report upon it.

It appears, however, that the men addressed to the Governor-General in the Isthmus, Maher Pasha, a Petition setting forth their grievances, and that his Excellency promised his intervention with the Company to obtain compliance with their demands.

As they did not return to their work, the Canal authorities sent fresh men on board the dredger, but the men on strike, assisted by about 100 roughs of the town, refused to leave the vessel or to allow the new hands to work her.

The Company applied to the Egyptian police to clear the vessel of the malcontents, and the Governor-General not having sufficient police force at his disposal to do so, applied to his Government for a reinforcement.

Fenwick Pasha, with some fifty-five men of the police, were dispatched to Port Saïd, but he, on his arrival, did not consider his force sufficient to deal with the strikers. He at the same time urged the Canal officers to get over the opposition of the men by conceding their demands, in conformity with the desire of the President of the Council, his Excellency Nubar Pasha.

The position of affairs being reported to the Managing Committee in Paris, it was resolved to decline to make concessions, and to insist on the men's removal.

A full report of the circumstances attending the strike, together with copies of the telegrams exchanged between the Company and their agent in Egypt, were forwarded to the London Consulting Committee, with a request that they should express an opinion on the situation. These documents (of which copies are inclosed for your Lordship's confidential information), were discussed at the meeting of the Committee in London on the 28th ultimo.

The commercial members of the London Committee were unanimously of opinion that discipline must be maintained, and that the interference of the Egyptian Government in affairs between the Company and its workmen would be disastrous to the future working of the Company.

Sir Rivers Wilson and Sir John Stokes were present at the meeting in London, but owing to communications received from your Lordship's Department, reserved their vote. Sir John Stokes reported the position in person at the Foreign Office immediately after the meeting.

We have this day attended the meeting of the Finance Commission and of the Conseil.

We were met on our entrance by the untoward news that on Saturday evening the 29th ultimo, the Chief Engineer of the Company, M. Lemasson, had been assassinated at Ismaïlia. It is not known by whom the murder was committed, but there is a disposition here to connect the crime with the strike. There is, however, nothing so far to prove this, and no one had been reported as arrested up to 4 o'clock this afternoon.

This event has caused much excitement to prevail in the discussions which have taken place this day. The President, M. Guichard, does not hesitate to ascribe the difficulty with the strikers to the weakness of the Government in appearing to side with them, instead of at once repressing disorder when requested by the Company to do so. The deplorable incident at Ismaïlia is attributed to the feeling created by this attitude, whilst blame is attached to the Government for leaving a town like Port Saïd with its 30,000 inhabitants, largely composed of disorderly characters, provided with such an insignificant force that it could not cope with some eighty men on strike, backed up by as many roughs of the town.

The Greek Consul-General is also blamed for not using his influence with his

* Copy to Cairo.

compatriots to put an end to the strike instead of urging the Company to grant their demands.

The Conseil fully approved the action of the Managing Committee in refusing concessions which would weaken discipline, and in throwing upon the Egyptian Government the entire responsibility of maintaining order.

The President strongly insists on the fact that the Company have not dismissed the men, who have of their own free will left their work, and that the Company cannot submit to their dictation without loss of authority in future.

In the discussion of this matter by the Conseil, more than one of the Directors inquired whether the demands of the strikers were not to some extent well founded, but it was agreed that if any change can be made in the position of the men working the marine dredger, it must be made when work has been resumed, and not conceded to acts of violence.

The importance of the matter from a technical point of view, is the necessity of completing before the winter the usual deepening of the entrance before the winter gales send silt across and into it. Five valuable weeks have already been lost, and it is urgent to complete the work.

The Conseil finally decided, in view of the general situation, that two of the three Directors who would, as usual, be deputed to inspect the Canal this winter, should advance their departure, and M. Patinot and Prince d'Arenberg will probably leave Paris on the 3rd instant for Egypt.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure in No. 64.

Memorandum respecting the Strike at Port Saïd, September 25, 1894.

[See No. 54.]

No. 65.

Mr. Austin Lee to Foreign Office.—(Received October 4.)

(Telegraphic.) P. *Paris, October 4, 1894.*

A STRONG wish was expressed by the President this morning at a meeting of Committee of Suez Canal, that Lord Cromer would at once use his influence to induce Egyptian Government to take strike seriously in hand, and prevent possible stoppage of traffic by malicious injury to works and machinery, and also intimidation by strikers.

The opinion here is that pressure in the contrary sense has been brought to bear by the Greek Consul-General.

Instructions have, I understand, been received by the French Minister to consult Lord Cromer with a view to joint action.

Further police arrived at Port Saïd last night; the strike is reported to be spreading.

No. 66.

The Earl of Kimberley to Lord Cromer.

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, October 4, 1894, 6·45 P.M.*

WE learn that Directors are determined to stand their ground, and look to Egyptian police to maintain order.

We can give them information, but they object to advice either from Egyptian Government or Her Majesty's Government. Do you agree in apprehension of Vice-Consul as to landing of French sailors?

Telegraph your view of the position.

No. 67.

Lord Cromer to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 4.)

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, October 4, 1894.*

WHILE returning to Cairo I spent a short time yesterday at Port Saïd. It appears to me, from what I have learnt so far, that a very general sympathy is felt for the men on strike. I have taken the opportunity of impressing on all the Egyptian authorities concerned that the relations existing between the Company and its workmen do not in any way call for their interference, and that they must confine themselves to the maintenance of public order. Reinforcements have been sent to the police force at Port Saïd. I drew the special attention of the authorities to the necessity of keeping a guard over the dredgers in order to obviate the possibility of one of them being sunk in the Canal. I have given instructions to the Senior Naval Officer that unless circumstances of the most urgent necessity should arise, which I do not anticipate, he is not to land any men from Her Majesty's ships. I have told him, however, that in the improbable event of men being landed from the French ship he is to do the same. It is expected that Her Majesty's ship "Boadicea" will arrive on Saturday. I see no necessity for detaining her, and have so informed the Senior Naval Officer. The Governor has received instructions from Nubar Pasha to use his best endeavours in concert with the Greek Consul to induce some of the ringleaders to leave Egypt, paying, if necessary, small sums of money for that purpose.

It is almost impossible to guard against the occurrence of another assassination like that of M. Lemasson, but at present there does not appear to be much danger of any serious disturbance.

No. 68.

Lord Cromer to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 5.)

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, October 5, 1894.*

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram of yesterday's date, respecting the strike at Port Saïd, I have the honour to report that it appears to me that all that is possible is being done by the Egyptian Government to prevent the occurrence of disturbances. Some efforts to settle the matter, which though well-intentioned were not, perhaps, very judicious, were originally made by the Governor of Port Saïd, but strict orders to abstain from interference or from the expression, as far as the merits of the case are concerned, of any opinion, have now been sent to him. My acquaintance with the facts is not sufficient to justify my offering any advice, and I do not propose to do so, but the action of the Company appears to be universally blamed here, as far as I can gather, and I think that confidential information of this should be communicated to the English Directors. The opinion is expressed here that the whole affair might have been prevented from the outset by the display of a little judgment and conciliation and that the strikers have some justice on their side, while it is said that the Company's subordinates have been harsh and overbearing in their conduct towards the workmen. It is impossible for me to say what justification there may be for these criticisms. It appears that the Company's agents on the spot are more moderate, while they are certainly better informed than the authorities in Paris, and I think the Directors would do well to be guided by their advice.

The French Consul-General has not spoken to me on the subject although I saw him to-day. I learn, however, from Nubar Pasha, that M. Cogordan suggested that the French sailors might help if the Egyptian forces were not sufficient. The offer was politely declined by the Egyptian Government, whose attempts to get the ringleaders to leave the country have met with no success on account of the excessive demands advanced by them for pecuniary assistance.

No. 69.

The British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 5.)*

(No. 24. Commercial. Confidential.)

My Lord, *London, October 5, 1894.*

REFERRING to our immediately preceding despatch, we have the honour to report that we learn from the President of the Suez Canal Company, M. Guichard, that the strike has spread to the men working the dredgers in the first section of the Canal as well as to the workshops at Port Saïd. Neither of these classes of men allege any grievance, or formulate any demand, but are represented as acting under compulsion and intimidation.

M. Guichard in his letters urges that grave disorders may occur unless there is an unmistakable display of force to overawe the malcontents; and suggests that Lord Cromer should, in concert with the French Minister, rouse the President of the Council from his present apathy.

We have hitherto abstained from any word or action implying any interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government in this matter; but in view of this direct appeal on the part of M. Guichard, we conceive it to be our duty to bring it before your Lordship.

We desire to express the opinion that the force of police in the Isthmus of Suez is not sufficient to control so large a population of unruly elements, especially when there is a spirit of mischief abroad.

M. Guichard draws a comparison between the present inaction of the Egyptian Government and their vigorous action in 1874, when they dispatched 10,000 troops to the Isthmus to compel M. De Lesseps to conform to the decisions of the Constantinople Commission adopted by His Majesty the Sultan.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.

No. 70.

Foreign Office to Sir J. Stokes.

Dear Sir John, *Foreign Office, October 6, 1894.*

I SEND the substance of a telegram received from Lord Cromer.† It speaks for itself. He feels bound to tell what he sees and hears, but neither he, nor the Egyptian Government, nor the officials, will interfere in the management of the strike. He seems to think, from some confidential remarks not included in the telegraphic summary, that the Directors might do well to be guided mainly by the advice of the responsible agents on the spot, who seem to him to be moderate and are certainly well informed.

He mentions the report of the suggested landing of French sailors only to treat the idea as impossible of realization.

Yours truly,
(Signed) H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 71.

Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 10.)

(No. 21. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Cairo, October 3, 1894.*

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch which I have this day received from Mr. Vice-Consul Maling, reporting on the position of affairs at Port Saïd. Since this despatch was written it has transpired that the crews of three more dredgers have joined the strikers, thus, presumably, doubling their numbers.

I regret to report that M. Lemasson, the Chief Engineer of the Company, has succumbed to the injuries which he received at Ismaïlia. He had been dining out and was walking home alone, when an unknown individual fired two shots at him and escaped.

* Copy to Cairo. † No. 68

M. Lemasson had for a long time been extremely unpopular with the workmen employed by the Suez Canal Company, and had, it is stated, repeatedly received menacing letters. It does not, therefore, necessarily follow that this lamentable occurrence need be attributed to other motives than those of private vengeance.

To his influence was attributed, rightly or wrongly, the exclusion of the workmen from participation in certain bonuses divided some time ago among the employés of the Company, and he is further represented as having been the chief obstacle to any policy of conciliation in the present strike.

The position of the Egyptian Government is a very difficult one. So long as any hope of conciliation remained they were, naturally, reluctant to take any coercive measures which might drive a band of desperate men to individual acts of violence, while at the same time they were aware that sympathy here among the numerous fellow-countrymen of the strikers has hitherto been entirely with the workmen, who would at the outset have been pacified by a small concession, the rejection of which, in view of the liberal outlay of the Company in other directions, and the peculiar position of foreign labourers in Egypt, they fail to consider justified.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RENNELL RODD.

Inclosure in No. 71.

Acting Consul Maling to Mr. Rodd.

Sir, *Port Saïd, October 1, 1894.*

WITH reference to the dredgers' strike, I have the honour to report that no progress whatever has yet been made in the way of settling the difficulty, and it appears that the Canal Company is determined not to give in to the strikers, but insists on their unconditional surrender, and expulsion of fifteen of the ringleaders; this the strikers will not accept.

I have been informed, confidentially, by a person high in authority that, should coercive measures be taken against the strikers or their ringleaders, violence and murders similar to the case of M. Lemasson would ensue, which all the efforts of the most active police would be powerless to prevent.

The race to which the great majority of the strikers belong are capable of anything, and are the most difficult subjects to deal with under any conditions, and should force be employed to send any of the ringleaders out of the country, and the least disturbance ensue, it is greatly to be feared that the French ship-of-war, the "Troude," will at once seize the opportunity, on the plea of protecting the French residents, to land her men.

I called this evening, with Commander Simons, of Her Majesty's ship "Melita," on the Governor-General. His Excellency stated that the force at his disposal was sufficient to maintain order, but he said that he had represented to his Government that reconciliatory measures should be resorted to in dealing with the strikers, and pressure be brought to bear on the Canal Company to come to some reasonable terms with the men.

Commander Simons told the Governor-General that Her Majesty's ship "Boadicea" was hourly expected here from Aden, and that her presence may have some effect on the disaffected.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. F. MALING.

No. 72.

Foreign Office to Sir J. Stokes.

Dear Sir John, *Foreign Office, October 11, 1894.*

I SEND you an extract from a report from the Acting Consul at Port Saïd to Rodd.* Possibly it tells you nothing that you do not know already.

Yours truly,
(Signed) H. PERCY ANDERSON.

---

* Extract of Inclosure in No. 71.

No. 73.

Lord Cromer to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 12.)*

(Commercial.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Cairo, October* 12, 1894.

WITH reference to the strike at Port Saïd. The Greek Consul-General and M. Patinot were yesterday in consultation. It was agreed that the strikers should be paid their travelling expenses home, and that a small indemnity should be given to each. The matter should thus be settled, I think.

No. 74.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received October 20.)

Sir, *Admiralty, October* 18, 1894.

I AM commanded by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a letter from the Commander of Her Majesty's ship "Melita," dated the 1st instant, respecting the strike of Suez Canal employés.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

Inclosure in No. 74.

Commander Simons to Admiral Sir M. Culme-Seymour.

Sir, *"Melita," at Port Saïd, October* 1, 1894.

I HAVE the honour to report that the strike of the Suez Canal employés, mentioned in my letter of the 24th ultimo, and telegram of to-day's date, still continues.

2. This strike has in the last week assumed more prominence, subscriptions having been raised in the town for the strikers, and the murder of M. Lemasson, Chief Engineer to the Canal Company, being attributed to it.

3. The strike, which is confined to about 100 Greeks, formerly employed in the dredgers at Port Saïd, arose, I am informed, from their requesting regular continuous pay, whether the dredgers were at work, or, as frequently happened, idle from bad weather at the entrance of the harbour, during which time they were kept on board without pay till the weather moderated.

4. The Canal Company first refused compliance, then M. Lemasson arranged terms, but subsequently cancelled the arrangements by orders from Paris, the ring-leaders of the strike being the difficulty.

5. The strikers create no general disturbance, but M. Lemasson's murder is attributed to them, and they are said to have threatened other Canal employés.

6. M. Lemasson was shot at Ismaïlia when entering his house in the evening; he was personally unpopular, and there is at present no evidence that it was a striker who shot him.

7. The French Consul immediately proceeded to Ismaïlia, and is still there trying to catch the murderer, and the Captain of the French ship "Troude," I am informed, lodged a protest that the Canal employés should have had police protection.

8. In concert with the English Vice-Consul, the Consul being away, I to-day visited the Governor and offered him assistance in maintaining order if required, at the same time informing him of the probable arrival of Her Majesty's ship "Boadicea" shortly, so that there would be plenty of English seamen to quell disturbance if it arose, and explaining that there would be no necessity for men landing from the French ship.

9. The Governor has 100 police, 50 coast-guard, and some 20 soldiers at his disposal, but is asking for orders from Cairo as to how to proceed; he considers he will not require assistance.

10. The Vice-Consul has informed Mr. Rennell Rodd, Acting Consul-General, of

* Communicated to Sir J. Stokes, October 12, 1894.

what has taken place. Lord Cromer arrives on Wednesday, and the English Consul, Mr. Gould, on the 10th.

11. The French ship "Tronde" was ordered here by telegram, I believe, at the request of the French Consul through his Consul-General at Cairo.

12. On Friday the 28th ultimo, I proceeded 10 miles outside the harbour and completed quarterly target practice, returning same afternoon.

13. The health of the ship's company remains very good.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. A. SIMONS.

No. 75.

Lord Cromer to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received October 22.)*

(No. 22. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Cairo, October* 8, 1894.

MR. RODD has already reported to your Lordship, in his despatch No. 141 of the 20th ultimo, on the origin and progress of the strike amongst the Suez Canal Company's workmen at Port Saïd, and there is, therefore, little left for me to add on the subject.

The assassination of M. Lemasson, Chief Engineer of the Company, at Ismaïlia, on the night of the 29th September, has been the principal event to record. This act, which caused a profound sensation, is attributed to some dismissed employé of the Company and not to the strikers, they being all found at Port Saïd on the night in question, and able to account for themselves in a satisfactory manner. M. Lemasson was unpopular with the workmen; but when they heard of the murder they telegraphed to the Company's chief agent, asking to be allowed a special train in which to proceed to Ismaïlia to take part in the funeral. Their intention evidently was to dissociate themselves entirely from such acts of violence.

M. de Serionne, however, replied that, while touched by their telegram, he could not recognize them as a corporate body, but only as a number of workmen absent from their work without permission.

It is generally thought here that the Suez Canal Company have displayed a certain want of tact in dealing with this strike which might, by a few timely concessions and careful handling, have been prevented at the outset.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CROMER.

No. 76.

Mr. Austin Lee to Foreign Office.—(Received November 2.)

My dear Bergne, *Paris, October* 29, 1894.

I WAS astonished to see in the Suez Canal Print, Section No. 20, which I received this morning, in a Memorandum by Clarke of a conversation with M. Rouville, our Director, respecting the Port Saïd strike, sent to you by Phipps, that I "had personally been advising the Company not to make any concessions." De Rouville, of course, declares that he said nothing of the kind, but that, having received a letter from Phipps saying that *at my request* he wrote to deprecate any strong action and to advise conciliation, he had told Clarke that he could not understand this *volte face* on my part, as I had been present at the Council early in September when the President had communicated the instructions sent to Egypt, which were unanimously approved by all the Directors present, including myself and our English commercial colleagues.

You know that Phipps acted on a telegram addressed by the Foreign Office to me in Paris while I was absent on leave in Ireland, and only made use of my name in writing to M. de Rouville to avoid the appearance of official interference with the Company's affairs; but he did not know the previous history of the strike or the Company's action.

* Copy to Suez Canal Directors, October 29, 1894.

As a matter of fact, I was away on leave when the first news of the strike reached Paris, about the 20th August, and only heard of it from the Company at the Conseil above referred to. I left Paris again after the Conseil which I had come over to attend, and knew nothing of what had taken place in the interval until I called at the Foreign Office and saw you, as you will remember, on the 29th September, so I was in no way responsible for the measures adopted, although I confess that, judging by the experience we have had in the way of strikes and disturbances among our workmen, conciliatory measures have hitherto not produced any lasting effect.

No. 77.

*British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.**—(*Received November* 8.)

(No. 25. Commercial.)

Paris, November 5, 1894.

My Lord,

WITH reference to our despatch No. 22, Commercial, of the 7th August last, we are glad to be able to inform your Lordship that at the meeting of the Suez Canal Directors this day it has been agreed to reduce, from the 1st January next, the price of the water supplied by the Company to the inhabitants of Port Saïd from 1 fr. 50 c. to 1 fr. per cubic metre.

It is estimated that this reduction will entail upon the Company a loss of about 100,000 fr. (4,000*l.*) per annum, but it is hoped that this sum will be made up by the increased consumption, and by the rigid measures it is proposed to adopt to prevent the pilfering of water, which has hitherto largely prevailed from the meters being tampered with by the water-carriers.

We understand that the quality of the water has already been greatly improved by the cleaning of the conduits, and it is hoped that there will be no further cause for complaint, more especially as the recently constructed filters will insure a constant supply of the purest water.

We have, &c.

(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 78.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(*Received November* 8.)

Admiralty, November 7, 1894.

Sir,

I AM commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a copy of a voucher for the payment, by the Paymaster of Her Majesty's ship "Crescent," on the 5th April last, of the sum of 1,800 fr., equivalent to 71*l.* 8*s.* 7*d.*, for the hire of a tug in attendance on that ship during her passage in the Suez Canal between Port Saïd and Ismaïlia, being one-half of its length.

In Article 12, paragraph 3, clause 2, of the "Regulations for the Navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal," the charge for such attendance is defined as follows:—

"It is hereby provided that when a tug shall only have accompanied or towed a vessel one-half of the length of the Canal, 600 fr. shall be levied for the return trip of a first class, and 400 fr. for a second class tug, and one-half only of the total towage or tender dues shall be charged."

It would therefore appear that an overcharge of 600 fr. has been made by the Canal Company in this instance, which overcharge, as will be seen from the accompanying copy of a report from the present Captain of the "Crescent,"† was pointed out at the time to the Canal authorities, who, however, "positively refused to accept less than 1,800 fr."

* Copy to Cairo, No. 36, Commercial, November 13, 1894.

† Not printed.

Under the circumstances, I am to request that you will move the Earl of Kimberley to cause a reclaim for the overcharge to be preferred upon the Company.

I am, &c.

(Signed) R. D. AWDRY.

No. 79.

Lord Cromer to the Earl of Kimberley.—(*Received November* 12.)

(No. 23. Commercial.)

Cairo, November 1, 1894.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my Commercial telegram of the 12th ultimo, and to previous correspondence on the subject of the recent strike at Port Saïd, I have the honour to transmit herewith an extract of a despatch from Mr. Gould, reporting the settlement of the matter.

I have, &c.

(Signed) CROMER.

Inclosure in No. 79.

Mr. Gould to Lord Cromer.

(Extract.)

Port Saïd, October 30, 1894.

REFERRING to Mr. Acting Consul Maling's reports to your Lordship on the subject of the strike of the crews of some of the Canal Company's dredgers, I have the honour now to report that the whole affair appears to be at an end. Most of the men who struck have been sent away from here with such compensation as apparently quite satisfies them.

The French second class cruiser the "Tronde" left here the day before yesterday for Greece.

No. 80.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(*Received November* 12.)

(No. 26. Commercial.)

Paris, November 6, 1894.

My Lord,

AT the monthly meeting yesterday of the Directors of the Suez Canal Company M. Patinot made a long statement as to the result of his own and Prince d'Arenberg's mission to Egypt in connection with the recent strike of the Company's workmen at Port Saïd.

Your Lordship has been already informed by Lord Cromer of the concessions which were made to the strikers, of whom the total number appears to have been 108. They and their families, to the number of 468, are to be returned to their homes at the expense of the Company, and will receive an indemnity based upon the length of their services.

It is estimated that the total cost of these measures will amount roughly to about 100,000 fr. (4,000*l.*).

Some dissatisfaction was expressed at the extent to which the concessions made by the Company had been taken advantage of by the Greek Consul to effect, at the expense of the Company, the repatriation of many of his undesirable compatriots, on the ground of their being dependent for their existence upon the wages earned by the strikers. For one family alone, consisting of father, wife, four children, mother, father, mother-in-law, and four brothers-in-law, have been sent to their home at a cost of about 100*l.*,

the father being the only employé of the Company. There were numerous other cases of a similar character.

It is hoped that, in view of the sacrifices made by the Company, the Egyptian Government will take steps to prevent the return of these individuals to Port Saïd, and Nubar Pasha promised M. Patinot to consider the matter.

M. Patinot stated that Nubar Pasha had gone so far as to propose to share the cost of the repatriation of the strikers with the Suez Canal Company, but that he had not thought it advisable to accept the offer, which, possibly, was not seriously made.

The appointment of a successor to the late M. Lemasson, Chief Engineer, who was assassinated at Ismaïlia, was upon the order of the day.

The President stated that there was no one in the Company's employment in Egypt qualified for promotion to the post, but that an application had been received from a M. Quellenec, an Engineer of the Department of the Ponts et Chaussées, who had been detached by the French Government for special service in Greece, and had subsequently entered the service of the Greek Government as Consulting Engineer. No other application had been received, and as M. Quellenec's appointment was recommended by the Comité de Direction, who had made inquiries as to his antecedents and qualifications, which appear to be of a high order, the Conseil unanimously sanctioned it.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
C. RIVERS WILSON.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

No. 81.

Foreign Office to British Suez Canal Directors.

(No. 10. Commercial.)
Gentlemen, *Foreign Office, November* 12, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Kimberley to transmit to you herewith copy of a letter from the Admiralty respecting an alleged overcharge by the Suez Canal authorities for the towage of Her Majesty's ship "Crescent" on the 5th April last.*

I am to request you to inquire into this case, and to furnish Lord Kimberley with a report on the subject.

I am, &c.
(Signed) H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 82.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received November 29.)

(No. 27. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Paris, November* 26, 1894.

IN reply to your despatch No. 10, Commercial, of the 12th instant, we have the honour to inform your Lordship that the Managing Committee of the Suez Canal Company in Paris, having considered the question of the alleged overcharge for the towage of Her Majesty's ship "Crescent" on the 5th April last, decided that it was not justified, and orders were accordingly sent to their agent in Egypt, by the mail of the 23rd October last, to reimburse the sum of 600 fr. to the Admiralty authorities.

We have, &c.
(Signed) J. STOKES.
H. AUSTIN LEE.

---

* No. 78.

No. 83.

British Suez Canal Directors to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received December 12.)

(No. 28. Commercial.)
My Lord, *Paris, December* 10, 1894.

IN reply to your Lordship's despatch No. 8, Commercial, of the 1st October last, we have the honour to transmit herewith the Returns asked for by the Admiralty regarding the groundings in the Suez Canal during the years 1891 and 1892, which we have this day received from the Company.

We have, &c.
(For the British Directors),
(Signed) H. AUSTIN LEE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 83.

RETURN drawn up by the Suez Canal Company, showing the Groundings in the Suez Canal in the Year 1891.

Armateurs des Navires.	Nombre total de Navires ayant transité.	Nombre d'Échouages de ces Navires.	Pourcentage correspondant pour chaque Armateur.	Décomposition des Échouages. de 30 m. à 1 h.	de 1 h. à 2 h.	de 2 h. à 3 h.	de 3 h. à 6 h.	de 6 h. à 9 h.	de 9 h. à 12 h.	de 12 h. à 24 h.	au-dessus de 24 h.	Total des durées d'Échouages.	Moyenne des durées d'Échouages.	Nombre de Navires arrêtés par Échouages. 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
												h. m.	h. m.												
1. Armateurs dont les navires ont effectué un minimum de vingt-quatre traversées—																									
Alexander, R., and Co.	91	4	4·40	2	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	17 15	4 18	1	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bates, Edw.	29	2	6·90	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	3 41	1 50	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bebin Line	47	1	2·13	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0 35	0 35	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
British India Steam Navigation Company	128	3	2·34	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	1	45 54	14 38	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1
Cayzer, Irvine, and Co.	103	4	3·88	1	1	...	...	1	1	...	...	20 17	5 4	1	1	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
China Shippers Mutual Steam Navigation Company	41	3	6·98	...	1	1	...	...	1	...	...	14 41	4 54	...	1	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
Cie. Transatlantique	26	1	3·85	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1 53	1 53	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Deutsche Ost Africa Linie	33	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	—	—	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Florio Rubattino	93	1	1·08	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1 31	1 38	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Glover Brothers	51	2	6·15	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2 4	1 2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gouvernement Anglais	70	1	1·43	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2 5	2 5	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Greenshields, Cowie, and Co. ...	40	1	2·50	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0 35	0 35	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hain, Edwards, and Sons	31	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hamilton, Fraser, and Co.	33	3	9·09	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	6 27	2 18	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hesse (Dampf. Gesellschaft)	60	3	5	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	14 44	4 55	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hardy, Wilson, and Co.	25	2	8	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	7 10	3 35	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Harrison, T. and J.	56	1	1·79	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2 32	2 32	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Henderson Brothers	79	2	2·52	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	6 3	3 1	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Henderson, P., and Co.	39	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Horskind and Woods	61	5	8·20	1	3	1	...	...	...	...	...	8 5	1 37	3	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Holt, Alfred	144	5	3·47	1	...	3	1	...	...	...	...	13 7	2 37	1	1	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Horsley, G., and Sons	29	3	10·34	1	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	4 18	1 36	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Jenkins, D. J. and Co.	33	1	3·03	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0 43	0 43	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lloyd Austro-Hongrois	45	2	4·44	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	8 57	4 28	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
MacGregor, Gow, and Co.	46	2	4·35	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	5 12	2 36	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mahaousich (Cie.)	24	2	8·17	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	27 46	13 53	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Messageries Maritimes	103	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Milburn, W., and Co.	45	2	4·44	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	6 18	3 9	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nederland (Stoomvaart Maatschappij)	69	1	1·45	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1 0	1 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Norddeutscher Lloyd	51	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Orient Line	53	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Peninsular and Oriental...	175	4	2·29	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	32 38	8 9	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Persian Gulf Steam Navigation Company	30	2	6·67	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	26 17	13 8	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rankin and Gilmour	24	3	12·5	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	38 14	12 45	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rhederei (Dampf. Gesellschaft)... ...	69	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Repuer, E., and Co.	67	9	13·43	4	2	1	...	...	...	1	...	31 8	3 28	3	2	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rotterdam Lloyd	59	2	3·39	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	12 25	6 12	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rowland and Marwood	30	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Stevenright, Baron, and Co.	25	1	4	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0 39	0 39	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Smith, G., and Sons	82	3	3·66	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	4 47	1 56	2	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Th. Wilson, Sons, and Co.	39	1	2·56	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	6 55	6 55	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
Wood, J. M., and Co.	66	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Totaux et Moyennes	2,416	83	3·55	26	20	10	9	4	4	2	5	373 12	4 38	34	14	9	16	3	1	3	1	...	...	...	1
2. Armateurs dont les navires n'ont pas effectué un minimum de 24 traversées. Ensemble 402 armateurs	1,791	155	7·84	39	32	19	16	14	5	6	4	567 45	4 12	51	37	16	12	10	3	1	2	2	1	...	2
Total	4,207	236	5·13	65	52	29	25	18	10	8	9	943 57	4 22	85	51	25	28	13	4	4	4	2	1	...	3

Armateurs des Navires.	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	Total des Navires arrêtés.	Moyenne des Navires arrêtés par Échouage.	Durée maximum des Arrêts imposés à la Navigation. au-dessous de 1 h.	de 1 h. à 2 h.	de 2 h. à 3 h.	de 3 h. à 4 h.	de 4 h. à 5 h.	de 5 h. à 6 h.	de 6 h. à 7 h.	de 7 h. à 8 h.	de 8 h. à 9 h.	de 9 h. à 10 h.	de 10 h. à 11 h.	de 11 h. à 12 h.	de 12 h. à 18 h.	de 18 h. à 24 h.	au-dessous de 24 h.	Total des Échouages ayant arrêté des Navires.	Total des durées des Arrêts imposés.	Moyenne des durées d'Arrêts.
																																	h. m.	h. m.
1. Armateurs dont les navires ont effectué un minimum de vingt-quatre traversées—																																		
Alexander, R., and Co.	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	16	4	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	3	66 34	5 25
Bates, Edw.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	0·50	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1 2	1 2
Bebin Line	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
British India Steam Navigation Company	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	17	5·47	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	2	109 28	6 26
Cayzer, Irvine, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	9	2·25	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	46 15	5 8
China Shippers Mutual Steam Navigation Company	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	3	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	3	39 41	4 24
Cie. Transatlantique	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1 55	1 55
Deutsche Ost Africa Linie	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Florio Rubattino	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Glover Brothers	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gouvernement Anglais	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Greenshields, Cowie, and Co. ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hain, Edwards, and Sons	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hamilton, Fraser, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	2	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 15	3 34
Hesse (Dampf. Gesellschaft)	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	16	5·33	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	2	87 5	5 27
Hardy, Wilson, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	0·50	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	0 44	0 44
Harrison, T. and J.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	4 48	2 24
Henderson Brothers	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	2 44	0 41
Henderson, P., and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Horskind and Woods	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	1·20	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	7 37	1 19
Holt, Alfred	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	10	2	3	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	9 41	0 58
Horsley, G., and Sons	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	0·67	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	3 50	1 55
Jenkins, D. J. and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lloyd Austro-Hongrois	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
MacGregor, Gow, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	7 32	3 41
Mahaousich (Cie.)	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	65	12·00	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	266 15	15 27
Messageries Maritimes	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Milburn, W., and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	2·20	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	7 41	1 32
Nederland (Stoomvaart Maatschappij)	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	0 30	0 30
Norddeutscher Lloyd	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Orient Line	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Peninsular and Oriental...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	0·50	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	6 45	0 22
Persian Gulf Steam Navigation Company	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	15	7·50	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	2	151 51	10 7
Rankin and Gilmour	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	0·67	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	6 19	3 9
Rhederei (Dampf. Gesellschaft)... ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Repuer, E., and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	34	3·78	2	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	6	291 2	8 34
Rotterdam Lloyd	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	2·50	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	21 1	4 12
Rowland and Marwood	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Stevenright, Baron, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Smith, G., and Sons	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	1·33	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	7 39	1 55
Th. Wilson, Sons, and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	7	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	55 55	3 43
Wood, J. M., and Co.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Totaux et Moyennes	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	200	2·47	15	8	5	4	2	...	3	1	1	...	2	2	1	3	1	47	1,317 39	6 35
2. Armateurs dont les navires n'ont pas effectué un minimum de 24 traversées. Ensemble 402 armateurs	2	2	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	329	2·44	16	23	8	4	6	4	2	7	2	...	1	2	4	2	2	84	1,867 14	5 41
Total	4	3	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	...	1	...	1	529	2·45	31	31	13	8	8	4	6	9	3	...	3	4	5	4	3	131	3,185 13	6 1

Paris, le 23 Juin, 1892.

Inclosure 2

RETURN drawn up by the Suez Canal Company, showing

Armateurs des Navires.	Nombre total de Navires ayant transité. — A.	Nombre d'Échouages de ces Navires. — B.	Pourcentage correspondant pour chaque Armateur.	Décomposition des Échouages. de 30 m. à 1 h.	de 1 h. à 2 h.	de 2 h. à 3 h.	de 3 h. à 6 h.	de 6 h. à 9 h.	de 9 h. à 12 h.	de 12 h. à 24 h.	en-dessous de 24 h.	Total des durées d'Échouages. — C.	Moyenne des durées d'Échouages. — C./B.	Nombre 0	1	2	3	4	5	6
												h. m.	h. m.							
1. Armateurs dont les navires ont effectué un minimum de vingt-quatre traversées—																				
Alexander, R. and Co.	73	1	1·37	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	7 32	7 32	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
Amirauté Anglaise	47	2	4·26	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1 23	0 42	...	1	...	...	1	...	...
Bates and Co.	25	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bedouin Steam Navigation Company	35	3	8·57	...	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	5 28	1 49	1	1	...	...	1	...	...
Bibby Brothers	26	1	3·85	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	31 54	31 54	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
British India Steam Navigation Company	102	3	2·94	...	...	1	...	2	...	...	...	14 15	4 45	...	...	...	1	2	...	...
Brocklebank, E.	31	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cayzer, Irvine, and Co.	90	4	4·44	...	2	1	...	...	1	...	...	13 55	3 39	...	2	1	1	...	...	...
China Mutual Steam Navigation Company	45	3	6·67	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	24 52	8 17	1	1	...	1	...	...	...
Cie. Translantica	28	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Deutsche Ost Afrika Linie	25	3	12	...	...	...	1	2	...	...	...	18 48	6 16	...	1	1	1	...	...	...
Florio Rubattino	56	1	1·79	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	7 11	7 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gladstone and Cornforth	23	3	12	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	1	79 19	26 26	...	1	...	1	...	...	...
Glover Bros.	31	2	6·45	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	3 19	1 39	1	1	...	...	...	...	...
Greenshields, Cowie, and Co.	26	1	3·85	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2 59	2 59	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Hansa (Dampf. Gesellschaft)	55	2	3·63	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	6 55	3 27	...	2	...	...	...	...	...
Harrison, T. and J.	59	1	1·69	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0 58	0 58	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Henderson Brothers	92	2	2·17	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	17 57	8 58	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
Henderson, T. and Co.	36	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hesketh and Woods	39	1	2·45	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	3 25	3 25	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Holt, Alfred	138	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Jenkins and Co.	33	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lloyd Austro-Hongrois	51	2	3·92	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	9 31	4 45	...	...	...	1	...	...	1
MacGregor, Gow, and Co.	40	2	5	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1 58	0 39	...	2	...	...	...	...	...
MacIver	35	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Messageries Maritimes	104	1	0·96	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2 53	2 53	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Milburn, W.	27	3	11·11	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	1	49 10	23 3	...	...	1	1	...	...	...
Nederland (Stoomvaart Maatschappij)	65	2	3·08	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	17 35	8 47	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
Norddeutscher Lloyd	51	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Orient Line	52	1	1·92	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2 15	2 15	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cie. Péninsulaire et Orientale	184	8	4·35	1	3	3	1	...	...	...	...	19 1	2 22	4	2	1	1	...	...	...
Persian Gulf Steam-ship Company	26	3	11·54	1	...	...	1	...	1	...	...	14 35	4 51	...	...	2	...	...	...	...
Rhederei (Dampf. Gesellschaft)	84	3	4·69	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2 45	0 54	1	1	1	...	...	...	...
R. Roper and Co.	36	2	5·55	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	6 32	3 26	...	2	...	...	...	...	...
Rotterdam Lloyd	61	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rowland and Marwood	27	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Stewright, Bacon, and Co.	26	2	7·69	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	5 27	2 43	...	...	1	...	...	1	...
Smith and Sons, G.	89	2	2·24	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	6 37	3 18	...	2	...	...	...	...	...
Th. Wilson, Sons, and Co.	31	2	6·45	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	3 11	1 66	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
Wood, J. M. and Co.	31	2	6·45	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	4 10	2 5	...	1	...	...	...	1	...
Totaux et Moyennes	2,102	68	3·23	14	15	10	11	9	2	4	3	405 10	5 57	14	21	9	9	5	3	1
2. Armateurs dont les navires n'ont pas effectué un minimum de 24 traversées. Ensemble 331 armateurs	1,457	83	5·69	23	18	3	12	9	6	6	6	523 29	6 19	32	16	14	5	3	2	2
Total	3,559	151	4·24	37	33	13	23	18	8	10	9	928 39	6 9	46	37	24	14	8	4	3

Paris, le 31 *Mai*, 1893.

in No. 83.

the Groundings in the Suez Canal in the Year 1892.

de Navires arrêtés par Échouage. 7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total des Navires arrêtés. — D.	Moyenne des Navires arrêtés par Échouage. — D./B.	Durée maxima des Arrêts imposés à la Navigation. en-dessous de 1 h.	de 1 h. à 2 h.	de 2 h. à 3 h.	de 3 h. à 4 h.	de 4 h. à 5 h.	de 5 h. à 6 h.	de 6 h. à 7 h.	de 7 h. à 8 h.	de 8 h. à 9 h.	de 9 h. à 10 h.	de 10 h. à 11 h.	de 11 h. à 12 h.	de 12 h. à 18 h.	de 18 h. à 24 h.	en-dessous de 24 h.	Total des Échouages ayant arrêté des Navires. — E.	Total des durées des Arrêts imposés. — F.	Moyenne des durées d'Arrêts. — F./D.	Moyenne définitive par Armateur. — F./A. Temps exprimé en Minutes.
																										h. m.	h. m.	m.
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1 50	0 55	1
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	2·50	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	5 9	0 38	4
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	1·67	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	12 59	2 36	22
...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	9	9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	63 15	7 2	146
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	11	3·67	...	...	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	21 47	1 53	15
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	1·75	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	18 32	2 39	11
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	1·33	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	2	24 56	6 14	33
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	2	1	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	17 40	2 56	45
1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	35 56	5 8	38
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	18	6	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	74 47	4 9	179
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	0·50	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1 7	1 7	2
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	4	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	5 45	1 36	18
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	3 3	1 51	5
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	11	5·50	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	2	60 31	3 41	26
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	9	4·50	...	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	17 18	1 55	20
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1 39	0 46	2
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	15	5	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	2	108 5	7 12	240
...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	11	5·50	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	2	90 48	8 15	84
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	0·87	2	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	4 17	0 45	3
...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	14	4·66	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	3	89 57	6 25	207
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	1	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	0 42	0 14	1
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1 47	0 53	3
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	3·50	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	13 49	1 49	30
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	4 16	2 38	4
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	6	3	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	8 2	1 20	16
1	1	1	3	...	...	...	1	170	2·40	20	10	5	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	...	...	5	1	...	54	666 40	3 55	...
1	...	2	1	1	1	2	...	179	2·16	16	7	4	4	2	2	2	2	1	2	...	...	4	2	2	51	1,130 35	6 19	...
2	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	349	2·31	36	17	9	8	4	5	3	3	2	3	...	...	9	3	2	105	1,797 21	5 9	...

No. 84.

Foreign Office to Sir J. Stokes.

(Separate.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, December* 12, 1894.

I AM directed by the Earl of Kimberley to inform you that it is considered desirable, as a mark of respect, that you should attend the funeral of the late M. de Lesseps, in your capacity of Vice-President of the Suez Canal Company, and I am to request that you will make arrangements to be present accordingly.

I am, &c.

(Signed) FRANCIS BERTIE.

No. 85.

Treasury to Foreign Office.—(Received December 14.)

Sir, *Treasury Chambers, December* 13, 1894.

I AM directed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to transmit herewith, to be laid before the Earl of Kimberley, a copy of a letter, dated the 28th ultimo, from the Admiralty (with inclosed plan, in original, to be returned), recommending that the lease of certain land at Port Saïd, now held by Mrs. Dowrie, should be cancelled, and that a new lease for a larger area at a lower rental should be granted to Messrs. Dowrie and Co.; and I am to request that you will move Lord Kimberley to obtain the opinion of Lord Cromer upon this proposal.

I am, &c.

(Signed) FRANCIS MOWATT.

Inclosure in No. 85.

Admiralty to Treasury.

Sir, *Admiralty, November* 28, 1894.

UNDER an Agreement, dated the 17th November, 1883, the Admiralty leased to Mr. Dowrie, of Port Saïd, a piece of land situated near the northern entrance to the Suez Canal at Port Saïd, measuring on the front and rear 50 metres, and in depth from front to rear 66 metres, for a term of seven years, at a rental of 100*l.* per annum.

The lease was renewed in favour of Mrs. Dowrie from the 1st October, 1890, for a further term of seven years.

An application has been received from Messrs. Dowrie and Co., acting for Mrs. Dowrie, to cancel the present lease, which would expire on the 30th September, 1897, and to grant them a new lease for twenty-one years from the 1st October, 1894, of an increased area, viz., 75 metres frontage by 66 metres in depth, as shown on the inclosed tracing, at a rental of 80*l.* per annum.

In forwarding the application, the Commander-in-chief supports a recommendation from the Senior Naval Officer at Port Saïd that the request be granted on the terms proposed, pointing out that the reduced rental for the larger area is, in his opinion, adequate, in view of the depreciation in the value of land generally at Port Saïd, and of the excessive rent now being paid.

As it is considered most desirable that some use should be made of this land rather than leave it unoccupied, and as the establishment of a respectable English firm of engineers on the property is also of advantage to the Admiralty, my Lords have provisionally acquiesced in Messrs. Dowrie and Co's. request, on condition that the lease shall be terminable at seven or fourteen years, and subject to the covering sanction of their Lordships of the Treasury, which I am to request may now be given.

I am, &c.

(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

No. 86.

The Earl of Kimberley to Lord Cromer.

(No. 42. Commercial.)

My Lord, *Foreign Office, December* 17, 1894.

I INCLOSE a letter from the Treasury asking for an expression of your Lordship's opinion on a proposal to grant a fresh lease of certain land held at Port Saïd by the Admiralty;* and I have to request you to give an opinion accordingly.

I am, &c.

(Signed) KIMBERLEY.

No. 87.

Sir J. Stokes to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received December 26.)

(Separate.) 13, *Telford Avenue, Streatham Hill, London,*

My Lord, *December* 24, 1894.

I HAVE the honour to report that, in obedience to your Lordship's directions conveyed in Mr. Bertie's despatch of the 12th instant, I attended the funeral of M. le Comte Ferdinand de Lesseps at Paris on the 15th instant.

The service was performed in the Church of St. Pierre de Chaillot, near the Champs-Élysées, whence the remains were carried to the Cemetery of Père La Chaise.

The procession was watched throughout the long route by many thousands of people with respect, and without any hostile manifestation, but also without that enthusiasm which would certainly have been displayed had the founder of the Suez Canal died before the misfortunes of Panamá.

At the grave speeches were delivered by M. Gréard, for the Académie Française; M. Joseph Bertrand, for the Académie des Sciences; M. Jules Guichard, for the Suez Canal Company; M. Théodore Cahu, for the Société des Gens de Lettres; M. Himly, for the Société de Géographie de Paris; M. Robiquet, President of the Association des Anciens Élèves du Lycée Henri IV.

I have deferred making this report until I could attach to it the official report of these speeches, which are given in the Bulletin Décadaire of the Company, of which I have the honour to inclose two copies,† and to be, &c.

(Signed) J. STOKES.

---

o

* No 85. † Not printed.